

# HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XV

APRIL, 1922

NUMBER 2

## LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

IN GERMANY, <sup>AND</sup> AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND, HOLLAND, AND THE  
SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES, 1914-1920

HANS WINDISCH

PROFESSOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN LEIDEN, HOLLAND

### CONTENTS

I. General.....	118
1. Introductions.....	118
2. Textual Criticism.....	120
3. New Testament Philology.....	123
4. Commentaries on the New Testament.....	125
II. The Synoptic Gospels.....	
1. Literary criticism.....	127
2. Contents of the Gospels.....	132
A. (a) Infancy narratives.....	133
(b) Buddhistic influence.....	135
(c) Semitisms.....	135
(d) Length of ministry.....	136
(e) Geography of Palestine.....	137
B. (f) Baptism and temptation.....	138
(g) Miracles of healing.....	138
(h) Sermon on the Mount.....	139
(i) Lord's Prayer.....	142
(j) Parables.....	143
(k) Death of John the Baptist.....	144
(l) Jesus' words to Peter.....	145
C. (m) Apocalyptic discourse.....	146
(n) Last Supper.....	146
(o) Passion and resurrection.....	147
3. Jesus Christ.....	150
A. Life of Christ.....	151
B. Jesus' conception of himself.....	154
C. Jesus' ethics, and use of the Old Testament.....	155
III. The Johannine Writings.....	156
IV. Acts of the Apostles.....	163

V. Paul and his Epistles.	
1. Chronology of the life of Paul . . . . .	168
2. Chronology of the Pauline epistles . . . . .	170
3. Genuineness of the Pauline epistles . . . . .	174
4. Integrity of the Pauline epistles . . . . .	177
5. Commentaries on the Pauline epistles . . . . .	179
6. Rise of the Pauline canon . . . . .	181
7. Pauline theology . . . . .	181
VI. Catholic Epistles; Hebrews; Apostolic Fathers . . . . .	193
VII. History of Early Christianity . . . . .	194
VIII. Theology of the New Testament . . . . .	199
IX. Elucidation of the New Testament from the History of Religions . . . . .	206

## ABBREVIATIONS

AAB	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
AGW	Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.
AR	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
BFTh	Beiträge zur Förderung der christlichen Theologie.
BibZ	Biblische Zeitschrift.
BphW	Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.
BSt	Biblische Studien.
ChrW	Die Christliche Welt.
DLZ	Deutsche Literaturzeitung.
Exp	The Expositor.
GerefThT	Tijdschrift voor gereformeerde Theologie.
GGA	Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen.
HThR	The Harvard Theological Review.
HZ	Historische Zeitschrift.
JThSt	The Journal of Theological Studies.
KRefSchw	Kirchenblatt für die reformierte Schweiz.
LZBl	Literarisches Zentralblatt.
NGW	Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.
NJklA	Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum.
NkZ	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.
NoTT	Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift.
NThSt	Nieuwe Theologische Studien.
NThT	Nieu Theologisch Tijdschrift.
PaJ	Palästinajahrbuch.
PrJ	Preussische Jahrbücher.
PrM	Protestantische Monatshefte.
RC	Revue critique.
RhM	Rheinisches Museum.
SAB	Sitzungsberichte der Akademie zu Berlin.
SAH	Sitzungsberichte der Akademie zu Heidelberg.
SchwThZ	Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift.
ThGg	Die Theologie der Gegenwart.



ThLBl	Theologisches Literaturblatt.
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung.
ThR	Theologische Rundschau.
ThRev	Theologische Revue.
ThSt	Theologische Studien.
ThStKr	Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
ThT	Theologisch Tijdschrift.
TT	Teologisk Tidsskrift.
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen.
WklPh	Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZDA	Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum.
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.
ZMR	Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft.
ZNW	Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZThK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.
ZwTh	Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie.

IF the scholars of various countries are to enter once more into the old fellowship of a common task, which was interrupted by the war, one of the first requirements is that all the national groups should acquaint themselves with the work done in the interval by the others. In the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1921, I published for the benefit of German scholars a survey of English and American literature on the New Testament from 1914 to 1920, and I have been glad to prepare likewise for this Review, and so for American and English colleagues, a critical account of the most important works on the New Testament produced during these years in Germany and the other countries named in the title of this article.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In consequence of the War two important bibliographical periodicals have unhappily been compelled to suspend publication, the *Theologische Rundschau*, in 1917, and the *Theologischer Jahresbericht*, the last issues of which appeared in 1914 and contain a survey of theological literature for 1913. The following are still maintained: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (Leipzig, Hinrichs); *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (Leipzig, Dörffling und Franke); *Die Theologie der Gegenwart* (Leipzig, Deichert), of which one number in the year is devoted to the New Testament; *Biblische Zeitschrift* (Freiburg, Herder; Roman Catholic); *Theologische Revue* (Münster, Aschendorff; Rom. Cath.). For a very short survey see A. Jülicher, *Das Neue Testament* (*Wissenschaftliche Forschungsberichte* VI, pp. 27-45, Gotha, Perthes, 1921).

## I. GENERAL

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS

*Knopf, R.*, Einführung in das N. T. (Sammlung Töpelmann: Die Theologie im Abriss 2). 394 pp. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1919. — *Feine, P.*, Einleitung in das N. T. 2. Aufl. 259 pp. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer, 1918. — *Barth, F.*, Einleitung in das N. T. 4. und 5. Aufl. 494 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1920. — *Kolmodin, Ad.*, Inledning till Nya Testamentets skrifter. I. viii, 432 pp. Stockholm, 1915 (see Deissner, ThGg, 1915, 330 f.; ThLZ, 1915, 463 f.). — *Clemen, C.*, Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments (Sammlung Göschen 285). 2. Aufl. 167 pp. 1919. — *Sickenberger, J.*, Kurzgefasste Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 2. Aufl. 166 pp. Freiburg, Herder, 1920. — *Van Veldhuizen, A.*, Het Nieuwe Testament (Bijbelsch-kerkelijk woordenboek II). 316 pp. Groningen, den Haag, Wolters, 1920.

The New Testament Introduction of R. Knopf (Bonn, † 1920) was meant primarily as a rapid survey for men in service in the war, like the other volumes of its series. But it may well be of use to other students and even to scholars, for it gives an admirable untechnical and lucid exposition of the discipline and of the present state of research, with literary references. It covers the language of the N. T.; the text; primitive Christian literature; the canon of the N. T.; contemporary history of the N. T. (political and religious); and the beginnings of Christianity. The criticism of the gospels is discussed in much detail, and it is interesting to observe that Knopf gives the reader his choice of various solutions of the problem of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, including the theory that the unknown author himself wrote under the mask of the Apostle John. The chapter on the text is relatively full, and is excellent in contents, although the lack of an introduction to von Soden's textual work is a defect. The last part (pp. 226–388) gives a short history of early Christianity, including Jesus and his teachings, the apostolic, and the post-apostolic period. In the teaching of Jesus several points, such as the kingdom of God and Jesus' idea of his own person, are thoroughly discussed. Knopf follows J. Weiss in his thorough-going eschatological view of the idea of the kingdom; he believes that Jesus designated himself as messiah and Son of Man, but that it is no longer possible for us to fix exactly the sense in which he used the two terms. In his exposition of Pauline theology his pro-



test against a one-sided exaggeration of the difference of Paul from Jesus is noteworthy. The book thus constitutes a very excellent introduction — it does not pretend to be more — and will stimulate to deeper study of the problems. See M. Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1920, No. 9–10.

A new and complete critical introduction to the New Testament is much needed. Jülicher has unfortunately been unable to make a revision of his excellent book; the edition of 1906 is still kept in print. *Feine's* book in a new edition does not meet the need, for it keeps too close to tradition. It has, however, its own value, and the new edition is in many respects an improvement. That it refers to the more recent literature is its great advantage over Jülicher. In spite of a tendency to moderate the concessions made to criticism in the earlier edition, some chapters, such as that on the Synoptic question, are very good. See Windisch, *ThT*, 1918, 310 ff.; Deissner, *ThGg*, 1918.

The Introduction by *F. Barth* (professor at Bern, † 1912), reprinted from the 2d edition (1911), with some references (pp. 470–473) to recent literature added by his son, contributes even less than *Feine* to the understanding of critical problems, but forms a good guide to the contents of the books of the New Testament.

*Clemen's* little book is a new edition with few changes, in which only the historical books are treated in any detail. *Clemen* gives solely his own views. Particularly worth reading are the sections on the Johannine writings.

*J. Sickenberger* (Roman Catholic professor at Breslau) gives a brief compendium of New Testament introduction (first published in 1916) from the Catholic point of view by a scholar well acquainted with Protestant literature. His solution of the Synoptic problem is interesting. He distinguishes between the (Aramaic and Greek) original Matthew and our canonical Matthew; Matthew and Luke both represent combinations of the (Greek) original Matthew with Mark.

The lexicon of *van Veldhuizen* (professor at Groningen) is a sort of Bible dictionary of the New Testament, including a biographical dictionary of the more important New Testa-

ment scholars, with a fuller treatment of Netherlands. The articles, mainly intended for the general reader, contain many references to Netherlands contributions to New Testament research, which may well make it of use to English-speaking readers.

## 2. TEXTUAL CRITICISM

*Groenen, P. G.* Algemeene Inleiding tot de Heilige Schrift. Geschiedenis van den Text. 375 pp. Leiden, Théonville, 1917. — *Pott, A.*, Der Text des Neuen Testaments (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt 134). 2. Aufl. 116 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1919. — *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Textum recensuit, apparatus criticum ex editionibus et codicibus manuscriptis collectum addidit *H. J. Vogels*. xvi, 661 pp. Düsseldorf, Schwann, 1920. — *Preuschen, E.*, Untersuchungen zum Diatessaron Tatians (SAH, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1918). 63 pp. — *Pott, A.*, De textu evangeliorum in saeculo secundo (Mnemosyne, 1920, 267–309, 339–365). Leiden, Brill. — *Vogels, H. J.*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Diatessarons im Abendland (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 8). viii, 152 pp. Münster, Aschendorff, 1919. — *Harnack, A. von*, Zur Revision der neutestamentlichen Textkritik. Die Bedeutung der Vulgata für den Text der katholischen Briefe und der Anteil des Hieronymus an dem Übersetzungswerk (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das N. T. 7). 130 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1916. — *Harnack, A. von*, Studien zur Vulgata des Hebräerbriefs (SAB, 1920, 179–201). — *Lietzmann, H.*, Die Vorlage der gotischen Bibel (ZDA 56, n. f. 44, 249–278). — *Klein, O.*, Syrisch-griechisches Wörterbuch zu den vier kanonischen Evangelien nebst einleitenden Untersuchungen (Beihefte zur ZAW 28). 123 pp. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1916.

A general survey of the history of the text of the Old and New Testament from the Catholic point of view is given by *Groenen*. He treats the versions in special detail (pp. 132–361; *per contra* the Hebrew text, pp. 39–58, the Greek, pp. 59–112), and of the versions gives most space to the Latin and the Netherlands. These sections are also of interest to students outside of Holland. The author confines himself mainly to historical information and an account of what has been done in the field.

*A. Pott*, who is now one of the best informed textual critics in Germany, has published a new edition of his popular history of the text of the New Testament, in which his discussion of von Soden's text is of special interest.<sup>1</sup> He entirely rejects von Soden's hypotheses about the text of Tatian and of Marcion.

<sup>1</sup> On von Soden's hand-edition, see H. Lietzmann, ZNW, 1914, 323–331; R. Knopf, GGA, 1917, 385–408; E. Preuschen, BphW, 1917, No. 37.



He himself has a predilection for the Western Text, which he believes to be pre-canonical.

A new edition of the text of the New Testament is that of *H. J. Vogels*, one of the ablest of the Catholic textual critics. It is patterned after Nestle's edition; but does not indicate Old Testament quotations by special type, and (an improvement) mentions in the apparatus the most important variants with only their ancient witnesses. In the text *Vogels* largely coincides with von Soden, although he does not share the latter's methods and views. His favorable judgment of the Vulgate and his caution with regard to the Arabic Diatessaron are noteworthy. See Pott, *ThLZ*, 1921, No. 3-4; Souter, *JThSt*, 1921, 174 f.

The thesis of von Soden that the ruin of the text of the gospels was largely due to the bad influence of the Diatessaron has necessitated a fresh investigation of Tatian. *E. Preuschen* (†1920) had planned a new edition, but left the work uncompleted at his death. His valuable article, 'Das Diatessaron und seine Bedeutung für die Textkritik der Evangelien,' draws attention to a certain kinship between Tatian and Marcion, explains the method of Tatian, with various examples, and, in opposition to Zahn, argues that the Diatessaron was originally written in Greek. His hypothesis that Tatian first collected the four gospels is unsatisfactory. It is to be hoped that some scholar will soon complete Preuschen's interrupted task.

Also from the competent pen of *A. Pott* von Soden's Tatian hypothesis meets criticism. Von Soden holds that the witnesses for the I (I<sup>a</sup>)-text (D it af sy<sup>sc</sup>) have all been influenced by Tatian. Pott objects that von Soden is inconsistent in defining the I-text, since in the course of his investigation he assigns the above-named witnesses to the degenerate textual form I<sup>a</sup>, and in actually constituting the I-text gives the preference to a group Φ, to which Eusebius is closely related. He also shows how untrustworthy is von Soden's method of determining the readings of Tatian, so that the great influence which he ascribes to Tatian is improbable. Equally unjustifiable is von Soden's treatment of the readings of Marcion, which he has mainly drawn from the above-named witnesses, but has used wrongly.

Pott's view is that (Justin), Tatian, and Marcion (and likewise D it syr.vet) attest a common second-century text, akin to the parallel recension of Acts (this last being also mistakenly regarded by von Soden as related to Tatian).

*H. J. Vogels* supports the theory of an Old Latin Diatesaron, relying on the Old Latin readings of the gospel harmony of Codex Fuldensis and those of a later Latin harmony found in two Munich manuscripts (14th century). The variants are presented in long lists. The theory is that Victor of Capua had a Latin harmony, which he revised, and that this harmony was the oldest Latin version of the gospels — an hypothesis which as yet lacks verification. Vogels agrees with von Soden that all variants from the Greek occurring in the Old Latin and Old Syriac texts go back to Tatian. See Hans von Soden, *ThLZ*, 1920, No. 15-16.<sup>1</sup>

*Harnack* illustrates from the Catholic Epistles and Hebrews the contention that more than in the past the text of the Vulgate must be regarded as a reliable witness. In the Catholic Epistles, as he tries to show, the Vulgate text rests on a very old Latin interlinear translation, somewhat improved in style, but well preserved. In nearly thirty cases he would prefer the Vulgate reading to the text of the modern editors (very remarkable, but doubtful, is the longer text found in the Vulgate in 1 Peter 3, 22). The conclusion from this study is that Codex Vaticanus is to be subordinated to Codex Alexandrinus and the versions. Harnack prints in full a Greek text in the form which he believes to be represented by Jerome in his Vulgate. See H. Lietzmann, *ThLZ*, 1916, No. 15.

The comparison of the Vulgate of Hebrews with the Old Latin translation shows, as *Harnack* points out in his other essay, that Jerome kept close to the Old Latin; he took as his basis the exemplar of d, used r for comparison, and inserted corrections of his own. According to Harnack it cannot be proved that he also used a Greek text. This last point calls for further research.

<sup>1</sup> For other contributions to the textual criticism of Vogels, see *BiblZ*, 1914, pp. 369 ff.; 1915, 322 ff.; 1916, 34 ff.; 1921, 301 ff. Cf. also J. Schäfers *Evangelienzitate in Ephrums des Syrers Kommentar zu den paulinischen Briefen* (Freiburg, Herder, 1917).



*Lietzmann's* examination of the Gothic version, particularly in the epistles of Paul, leads him to pronounce it an important representative of the oldest Koine. Every Gothic reading, he holds, must be treated as a Koine-reading, if it can be found in any other representative of the old Koine. The two forms A and B of the Gothic Bible are independent branches of a tradition, and neither of them is a new redaction. The hypothesis of Kauffmann, that the text of Ulfilas was later revised with the Latin Bible as a basis, cannot be proved: Ulfilas may himself have possessed a text of the Koine which had been subjected to Latin influence, or he may have consulted the Latin Bible, just as the omission of Hebrews in his New Testament is a sure proof of Latin influence.

The Syriac-Greek lexicon to the Gospels by *O. Klein* gives, with translation, the Greek equivalent for every Syriac word in the various Syriac translations. A Greek-Syriac index gives the pages on which the Greek word stands as an equivalent. Unfortunately the information is very unreliable, but if used cautiously the book may be of service. See K. Brockelmann, *LZBl*, 1917; E. Preuschen, *ThLZ*, 1917, No. 22-23; H. Gressmann, *DLZ*, 1918, No. 6; Elhorst, *NThT*, 1921.

### 3. NEW TESTAMENT PHILOLOGY

*Cremer, H.*, Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräzität. 10. Aufl., herausg. von J. Kögel. xx, 1230 pp. Gotha, Perthes, 1911-1915. — *Blass, F. - Debrunner, A.*, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. 5. Aufl. xviii, 336 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921. — *Meyer, P. M.*, Griechische Texte aus Aegypten. I. Papyri des neutestamentlichen Seminars der Universität Berlin; II. Ostraka der Sammlung Deissmann. xiii, 233 pp. Berlin, Weidmann, 1918. — *Schütz, R.*, Der parallele Bau der Satzglieder im Neuen Testament und seine Verwertung für die Textkritik und Exegese (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, N. F. 11). 27 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1920.

J. Kögel's very careful revision of *Cremer's* lexicon was begun in 1911 and finally completed in 1915. In this form the lexicon is an indispensable aid to all students of the New Testament; it has no rival. Its chief defect is that the editor has been too restrained in altering the character of *Cremer's* work, has not sufficiently used non-literary texts and the Apostolic

Fathers, and takes so little account of modern linguistic study and of the history of religions. Important articles such as *σωτήρ*, *σφαγίς*, are consequently unsatisfactory. The point of view is still too much that of Biblical literalism. See Wohlenberg, *ThLBl*, 1915, No. 24; *ThGg*, 1915.

The new edition of *Blass's* grammar has undergone no important changes, — only small additions, balanced by omissions.

The Berlin Greek Texts from Egypt, which we owe to *P. M. Meyer*, is a valuable addition to our knowledge of non-literary Koine texts and yields some fruit directly applicable to New Testament lexicography. The texts comprise documents of commercial life in Egypt, texts from the Decian persecution, and some very valuable letters, besides ostraka, — these last being mainly receipts for rent, including some Jewish ones. The texts are provided with a detailed commentary, in which frequent reference is made to their bearing on the New Testament, linguistically and otherwise; Deissmann has added important notes. See K. F. W. Schmidt, *WklPh*, 1916, No. 40; Windisch, *ThLZ*, 1917, No. 13.

*R. Schütz's* study of rhythmic structure in the New Testament is unfortunately merely a torso. He shows how, following the tendency of the Koine to introduce into prose poetic parallelism and kindred forms, gospels and epistles show much rhythmic structure, so that they consist of strophes and cola, the reconstruction of which may contribute to the solution of exegetical and critical questions. In pursuance of a suggestion of Eduard Norden, he prints larger and smaller sections in cola, which makes his thesis convincing. Reasons of rhythm lead him, for instance, to excise Mk. 2, 21 f. *τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ* as a gloss, likewise Mk. 4, 25 *καὶ ὁ ἔχει*. Rhythmical considerations may be decisive also as to the connection of clauses, as Schütz makes clear in 1 Cor. 7, 33 f., 36–38; 10, 16, etc. See Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1920, No. 25–26.



## 4. COMMENTARIES ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

In Meyer's Commentary (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht) as 7th edition of the volume on James a wholly new work by *M. Dibelius* was published in 1921.

In Lietzmann's Handbuch zum N. T. (Tübingen, Mohr), *E. Klostermann's* Luke was published in 1919, leaving only Heitmüller's Apocalypse to complete the work; and a second edition of *Lietzmann's* Romans (see below, p. 179) appeared in the same year. A supplementary volume will contain the Apostolic Fathers, and of this the following parts have appeared: *R. Knopf*, Didache, 1 and 2 Clement (pp. 1-184), 1920; *W. Bauer*, Ignatius and Polycarp (pp. 185-298), 1920; *H. Windisch*, Barnabas (pp. 299-413), 1920. This volume is like those on the New Testament, with introduction, translation, commentary, excursus, and epilogue.

The commentary on the New Testament edited by Theodor Zahn (Leipzig, Deichert) has two new volumes: G. Wohlenberg (†1917), 1 and 2 Peter and Jude (iv, 345 pp.), 1915, and Th. Zahn, Acts, chaps. 1-12 (pp. 1-394), 1919; chaps. 13-28, (pp. 395-884), 1921. *Wohlenberg's* exegesis rests, as usual, on a very careful and learned treatment of the text. He follows the Erlangen traditions, not without new variations of his own. 1 Peter was written by Silvanus under Peter's supervision in A.D. 64; somewhat earlier, probably originally in Hebrew (*Wohlenberg* thinks he has proof for this), Peter wrote 2 Peter, presumably for Christians in Galilee and the neighboring country. To the convincing grounds for the later, non-apostolic origin of 2 Peter *Wohlenberg* does not do justice. Jude was written after 2 Peter.

*Zahn's* new commentary shows all the merits and defects which distinguish the works of this great scholar. The treatment of the text presupposes the results reached in his "Urausgabe der Apostelgeschichte" (see below p. 164). The first five chapters are very detailed; further on the comment is often cursory and, as often in *Zahn's* other commentaries, leaves important questions untouched — particularly those of exegesis and historical criticism.

The following volumes of Zahn's series have appeared in new editions: *Th. Zahn*, Luke, 3d and 4th ed. (774 pp.), 1920; *Th. Zahn*, John, 5th and 6th ed. (733 pp.), 1921; *Ph. Bachmann*, 2 Corinthians, 3d ed. (435 pp.), 1918; *P. Ewald*, Philippians, 3d ed., brought out by G. Wohlenberg with an introduction by Zahn, 237 pp., 1917.

The widely-used commentary, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt*, edited, after the death of J. Weiss, by W. Bousset and W. Heitmüller, has appeared in a third edition (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1917-18). It is meant for lay readers, but is full of suggestion for scholars. The new edition is in four volumes. In Vol. I (Synoptics) the editors have here and there added remarks pertaining to the history of religions. In Vol. III (Acts, Hebrews, Catholic Epistles) Bousset has inserted in James interesting explanations drawn from the history of religions. In Vol. IV (John, — Gospel, Epistles, Apocalypse; with the Index) Heitmüller has revised his exposition of the Gospel, as well as that of the Apocalypse contributed by J. Weiss. The whole work is a characteristic document of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* in Germany; it unites the point of view of the history of religions with insistence on the religious value of the New Testament writings.

Of the corresponding Catholic work, *Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments* (Bonn, Hanstein) the following parts have recently appeared: *P. Dausch*, The three older Gospels, 1918; *F. Tillmann*, John, 1918; 2d ed. (292 pp.), 1921; *A. Steinmann*, Acts, 2d ed. (244 pp.), 1916; *A. Steinmann*, Thessalonians and Galatians (124 pp.), 1921; *J. Sickenberger*, Corinthians and Romans, 1919; 2d ed. (291 pp.), 1921; *M. Meinertz* and *F. Tillmann*, Epistles of the Imprisonment, 1918; *M. Meinertz*, Pastoral Epistles (101 pp.), 1916; *J. Rohr*, *M. Meinertz*, and *W. Vrede*, Hebrews, Catholic Epistles, Revelation (385 pp.), 1918.

A new undertaking is *Tekst en Uitleg. Praktische Bijbelverklaring*, edited by F. Böhl and A. van Veldhuizen (Groningen, den Haag, Wolters). The small, attractive volumes (usually 144 pages) contain an introduction, a new translation, and a brief



interpretation (often merely a paraphrase). For the New Testament have appeared *J. A. C. van Leeuwen*, Matthew, 1915; 2d ed., 1918 (very dependent on Zahn); *A. van Veldhuizen*, Mark, 1914; 2d ed., 1918; *J. de Zwaan*, Luke, 1917 (many valuable remarks in spite of limited space; the historical criticism is not always convincing); *J. de Zwaan*, Acts (154 pp.), 1920 (introduction and exegesis interesting from the point of view of the history of religions; see Windisch, ThLZ, 1921); *A. van Veldhuizen*, Paul; Romans, Corinthians, 1916; 2d ed., 1918 (with full bibliography); *H. M. van Nes*, Galatians — Philemon, 1919; *J. Willemze*, 2 Peter, Epistles of John, Jude, 1919 (with detailed anti-critical introductions; defends the genuineness of the *comma johanneum*); cf. ThLZ, 1920, No. 11/12.

## II. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

### 1. LITERARY CRITICISM

#### A

*Cladder, H. J.*, Unsere Evangelien. I: Zur Literaturgeschichte der Evangelien. viii, 262 pp. Freiburg im B., Herder, 1919. — *Soiron, Th.*, Die Logia Jesu. Eine literarkritische und literaturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum synoptischen Problem (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 6). vi, 174 pp. Münster, Aschendorff, 1916. — *Schmidt, K. L.*, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung. xviii, 322 pp. Berlin, Trowitsch, 1919. — *Dibelius, M.*, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, 108 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1919. — *Bauernefeind, O.*, Die literarische Form des Evangeliums (dissertation). 95 pp. Greifswald, 1915.

#### B

*Drescher, R.*, Das Markusevangelium und seine Entstehung (ZNW 17, 228–256). — *Meyer, E.*, Das Markusevangelium und seine Quellen (SAB, 1918).

*Cladder's* posthumous work on the gospels has been compiled from lectures prepared for Catholic theological students at the front. He often goes his own way — as in his adoption of the theory of a one-year ministry of Jesus, in the arrangement of the contents of Matthew, the explanation of how Mark was excerpted from Matthew, or the assumption that Luke used Matthew and derived his special material from the Apostle John, and that John is to be understood from Mark, whom he interpreted and expanded in opposition to the misrepresentations of Cerinthus. See BiblZ, 15, 361.

The most interesting study of the Synoptic question which appeared during the war is the book of the Franciscan father *Soiron*. As is well known, the papal Biblical Commission in 1911 condemned the theory of two sources. Hence a demonstration of the falsity of the hypothesis that Matthew and Luke used a collection of Jesus' words has become a necessity for Catholic science,<sup>1</sup> while in Protestant circles at the same time the theory has been under vigorous attack. Soiron's main argument is that the relation of the groups of sayings in Matthew and Luke can best be explained by the special circumstances of oral tradition; and he investigates the particular fashion in which oral tradition attaches together disparate materials by arbitrary mnemonic association. A very good analogy is to be seen in rabbinical tradition, which developed an astonishing virtuosity in retaining in the memory great masses of material. Soiron shows how in the discourses of Jesus the single words and groups of sayings are grouped by subject-matter and by catchwords. This would have taken place in oral instruction. It is most instructive to analyse from this point of view the larger and smaller groups of sayings in Matthew and Luke (and in Mark as well), and to follow the various ways in which the catchword-method is applied. Soiron holds that this practice makes the theory of sources superfluous; but he overlooks the fact that the principle of association would be equally followed in the case of the written collection of Jesus' sayings, so that the argument has no force against the theory of common written sources. The question remains whether the more general order and arrangement of the sayings in Matthew and in Luke is such that the laws and possibilities of oral tradition explain the situation in both gospels. The proof of this Soiron does not give.

Soiron also thinks that the doublets in Matthew and Luke can be used as evidence against the hypothesis of the 'Logia,' since they show how a double association could cause the same saying to appear in two places, as for instance, Matt. 5, 29 f., in attachment to the word βλέπειν, and 18, 8 f., to the word

<sup>1</sup> See also P. Dausch, *Die Zweiquellen-theorie und die Glaubwürdigkeit der drei älteren Evangelien* (Biblische Zeitfragen 7). Münster, Aschendorff, 1915.



σκάνδαλον. This is noteworthy; but of many doublets it can be shown that they occur once in a Markan context, the other time in a Logia-context, and this confirms the theory of two sources. Soiron's book deserves to be followed up, but it does not overthrow the theory now widely accepted. See Windisch, DLZ, 1918, No. 27-28; Bultmann, ThLZ, 1918, No. 19-20.

More interesting at present than the Synoptic problem is the investigation of the literary character of the gospels and of their component material. *Schmidt* starts from the view that the gospel stories were originally transmitted separately as single narratives, and that their collection in a gospel was the work of the evangelist. By the 'frame,' is meant the scheme of the gospel, the arrangement of material, with the consequent view of the course of Jesus' activity and of the succession of his deeds; but the term also includes the transitional, introductory, and concluding formulas by which the separate stories are joined to one another. Schmidt minutely examines these schemes and forms, especially for Mark, as well as the evangelists' literary art embodied in them, with the result that in the 'frame,' taken in its widest sense, we find not so much historical tradition as a literary product, which can of course be used for the reconstruction of history only with the greatest caution. "The oldest tradition of Jesus is the tradition of pericopes, a tradition of individual scenes and utterances, handed down in the church and for the most part lacking any definite indication of time or place." The gospels aim at an itinerary, a continuous report of Jesus' deeds and journeys, but this was the work of an author or compiler, and of the actual course of events only a fragmentary knowledge has been preserved. Schmidt remarks that with this understanding of the composition of our gospels we can scarcely expect to determine the duration of Jesus' ministry or the calendar date of the single incidents. The question also arises whether the distribution of the traditions between a Galilean period and a short visit to Jerusalem is right, and Schmidt discusses this, taking into consideration the divergent scheme of John. It is interesting to note that in the 'frame,' that is, in the transitional passages, much textual variation is found, a fact which shows the im-

portance of the 'frame' for the composition of the whole gospel. It is here evident afresh that the story of the passion differs in its literary character from the great central portion of the gospels. While the other pericopes with few exceptions were transmitted without note of place, time, or connection, we find in the story of the passion a closer connection between the pericopes, and more exact statements of place and time. Schmidt well urges that this narrative is of the type of acts of martyrs, which ordinarily give a continuous narrative of the martyr's sufferings. See E. Lohmeyer, *DLZ*, 1920, No. 19-20; H. Windisch, *Museum* (Leiden), August-September, 1920; J. Kögel, *ThLBl*, 1920, No. 6; R. Steck, *SchwThZ*, 1919, pp. 180 f.; J. de Zwaan, *NThSt*, 1920, pp. 119 ff.; G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, *NThT*, 1920.

While Schmidt limits himself to the composition of the gospels and the introductory and final sentences of the single pericopes, *M. Dibelius* takes up the various literary types of evangelical tradition, which he tries to define strictly and to connect with the original use of these sections in the practice and missionary work of the church. Mainly from the speeches of Acts (other testimony could also be adduced) he shows how the gospel stories were woven into the texture of apostolic sermons as didactic and apologetic illustrations. One definite type of gospel stories, which he thinks gained their specific form in didactic discourse, he terms 'paradigms,' that is, brief narratives with only the most necessary notes of situation and occasion; in these all the emphasis is put on a doctrinal decision or a moral rule (cf. Mark 2,1-3, 6; 11, 27 ff.). From these are clearly distinguished stories of greater length, furnished with much vivid picturesque detail, which may be designated as 'novels'; this sort are of less value for instruction and preaching, and serve rather for entertainment, to satisfy curiosity, and please the fancy. They contain more of the legendary and mythical. Mark likes these 'novels,' while Matthew is inclined to eliminate the 'novelistic' traits, and to alter the stories into 'paradigms.' When the narratives were collected and compiled into a gospel, the evangelist expanded them by explanatory additions; new pericopes, too, came into being,



such as the so-called *Sammelberichte*, and the undated and unlocated prophecies of the passion, which stamped a pragmatism on the material and expressed a theological tendency. Thus Mark gave his gospel a special character which had not originally belonged to the stories; the history is presented as a succession of secret epiphanies; the deeds of Jesus are understood only by the initiated. Mark has also spread over a large part of his gospel a twilight-glow of myth; his hero has become a god, who reveals his divine power and authority, although the figure of the teacher and human worker of miracles still shows beneath the retouching.

This account will make clear the fruitfulness of the definitions and constructions employed in this book. The work is not final; many of the definitions are too clear cut, and the author has not fully used the analogies from Jewish rabbinical literature and Greek philosophical tradition. But he has shown a way which later students must follow. See Bultmann, *ThLZ*, 1919, No. 15-16; P. Fiebig, *LZBl*, 1919, No. 22; Windisch, *ThT*, 1919, 371 ff.

O. Bauernfeind's dissertation, while not without merit, does not touch the real problems.

## B

Of the individual gospels Mark has been studied by R. Drescher, who finds the purpose of the author revealed in chapter 13, and takes that chapter to reflect the confusion of the years 66-70. Mark probably shared in the flight to Pella and wrote his gospel there; the connections with Pauline theology are not very close; Mark's information was highly defective.

Eduard Meyer has prepared the way for his book, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, of which two volumes appeared in 1921, by a study of the sources of Mark. Besides the apostolic discourse of chapter 13 he finds two main sources: a disciple-source, in which Jesus is surrounded by an indefinite throng of disciples, and an apostle-source, which presupposes the college of twelve apostles.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Regarding the note 'Ariston erigu' after Mk. 16, 8 in an Armenian manuscript cf. Schäfers, *BiblZ*, 1915, 24 f.

## 2. CONTENTS OF THE GOSPELS

## A

*Sloet, A. W. H.*, De tijd van Christus' geboorte. 74 pp. Bussum, P. Brand, 1919. — *Clemen, C.*, Gressmann's Erklärung der Weihnachtsgeschichte (ThStKr, 1916, 237-252). — *Geffcken, J.*, Die Hirten auf dem Felde (Hermes, 1914, 321-351). — *Boll, F.*, Der Stern der Weisen (ZNW, 1917-18, 40-48). — *Schmiedel, P. W.*, Die Geburt Jesu nach Mt. 1, 16 (SchwThZ 31, 1914, 69-82; cf. 32, 1915, 16-31). — *Riggenbach, E.*, Bemerkungen zum Text von Mt. 1 (SchwThZ 31, 1914, 241-249; 32, 1915, 117 f.). — *Grosheide, F. W.*, Matt. 1, 16b (ThT, 1915, 100-105, 490-492). — *Van Kasteren, J. P.*, De syro-sinaïetische lezing van Mt. 1, 16 (Studien 83, 1914, 458-462). — *Harnack, A. von*, Über den Spruch "Ehre sei Gott in der Höhe" und das Wort "Eudokia" (SAB, 1915, 854-875). — *Beth, K.*, Giebt es buddhistische Einflüsse in den kanonischen Evangelien? (ThStKr, 1916, 169-227). — *Clemen, C.*, Buddhistische Einflüsse im Neuen Testament (ZNW, 1916, 128-138). — *Schulthess, F.*, Das Problem der Sprache Jesu. 57 pp. Zürich, Schulthess und Co., 1917. — *Meinertz, M.*, Methodisches und Sachliches über die Dauer der öffentlichen Wirksamkeit Jesu (BiblZ 14, 1916, 119-139, 236-249). — *Hartl, V.*, Die Hypothese einer einjährigen Wirksamkeit Jesu (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 7). 350 pp. München, Aschendorff, 1917. — *Dalman, G.*, Orte und Wege Jesu (BFTh 23). 370 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1919.

## B

*Gressmann, H.*, Die Sage von der Taufe Jesu (ZMR, 1919, 86-90). — *Meyer, A.*, Die evangelischen Berichte über die Versuchung Christi (Festgabe für Hugo Blümner, 434-468). Zürich, 1914. — *Titius, A.*, Über Heilung der Dämonischen im Neuen Testament (Festschrift für N. Bonwetsch, 25-47). Leipzig, Deichert, 1918. — *Jaeger, J.*, Ist Jesus Christus ein Suggestions-therapeut gewesen? Eine medizinisch-apologetische Studie. 78 pp. Mergentheim, 1918. — *Nägelsbach, F.*, Der Schlüssel zum Verständnis der Bergpredigt (BFTh 20). 55 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1916. — *Nägelsbach, F.*, Die hohen Forderungen der Bergpredigt, Matth. 5, 33-42 (NkZ, 1919, 510-532). — *Köhler, K.*, Die ursprüngliche Form der Seligpreisungen (ThStKr, 1918, 157-192). — *Köhler, K.*, Der Κύριος Ἰησοῦς in den Evangelien und der Spruch vom Herr-Herr-sagen (ThStKr, 1915, 471-490). — *Fiebig, P.*, Jesu Worte über die Feindesliebe (ThStKr, 1918, 30-64). — *Fridrichsen*, Geheiligt werde dein Name (TT 8, 1916). — *Böhmer, J.*, Die neutestamentliche Gottesscheu und die drei ersten Bitten des Vaterunsers. 211 pp. Halle, Mühlmann, 1917. — *Schmiedel, P. W.*, Die vierte Bitte im Vaterunser (PrM, 1914, 358-364; 1915, 23-26). — *Völter, D.*, "Unser täglich Brot" (PrM, 1914, 274-276; 1915, 20-23). — *Kuhn, G.*, (SchwThZ, 1919, 191-198). — *Fiebig, P.*, Das Wort Jesu vom Auge (ThStKr, 1916, 499-507). — *Völter, D.*, Eine vorkanonische Conjectur im N. T. und ihre Folgen (NThT, 1919, 22-42). — *Kögel, J.*, Der Zweck der Gleichnisse Jesu im Rahmen seiner Verkündigung (BFTh 19). 130 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1915. — *Oort, H.*, Lazarus (ThT, 1919, 1-5). — *Gressmann, H.*, Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus. Eine literargeschichtliche Studie mit ägyptologischen Beiträgen von G.



Möller (AAB, Phil.-hist. Klasse). 90 pp. Berlin, 1918. — *Windisch, H.*, Zum Gastmahl des Antipas (ZNW 18, 1917-18, 73-81). — *Zondervan, P.*, Het gastmaal van koning Herodes (NThT 7, 1918, 131-153). — *Immisch, O.*, Matthaeus 16, 18 (ZNW, 1916, 18-32). — *Dell, A.*, Zur Erklärung von Matth. 16, 17-19 (ZNW, 1916, 27-32). — *Harnack, A. von*, Der Spruch über Petrus als den Felsen der Kirche (Matth. 16, 17 f.) (SAB, 1918, 637-654).

## C

*Corssen, P.*, Das apokalyptische Flugblatt in der synoptischen Überlieferung (WklPh, 1915, Nos. 30-31 and 33-34). — *Völter, D.*, Die eschatologische Rede Jesu und seine Weissagung von der Zerstörung Jerusalems (SchwThZ, 1915, 180-202). — *Otto, R.*, Vom Abendmahl Christi (ChrW, 1917, No. 14). — *Schmiedel, P. W.*, Das Abendmahl und das Kiddusch (PrM, 1917, 225-239). — *Goetz, K. G.*, Das Abendmahl eine Diatheke Jesu oder sein letztes Gleichnis? (Untersuchungen zum N. T. 8). 90 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1920. — *Schlatter, A.*, Die beiden Schwerter, Lukas 22, 35-38 (BFTh 20). 75 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1916. — *Dibelius, M.*, "Herodes und Pilatus" (ZNW 16, 1915, 113-126). — *Dibelius, M.*, Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der Leidensgeschichte des Petrus- und des Johannesevangeliums (Abhandlungen zur semitischen Religionskunde und Sprachwissenschaft für W. Graf Baudissin, 125-150). Giessen, Töpelmann, 1918. — *Spitta, F.*, Die Auferstehung Jesu. 133 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1918.

## A

(a) *Infancy narratives*

*Sloet* (Roman Catholic) uses Josephus to fix the date of Jesus' birth. Starting from the hypothesis (because of the plural *οἱ ζητοῦντες*, Matt. 2, 20) that Antipater was concerned in the murder of the innocents at Bethlehem, he concludes that the flight into Egypt must have taken place before Antipater made his journey and fell into disgrace, that is, before May A.U.C. 749. The census is dated by supposing that it was taken in Palestine coincidently with the general oath of allegiance of the Jews ordered by Herod in A.U.C. 748; thus Jesus was born in 6 B.C. The difficulty that at this time either Saturninus or Varus, and not Quirinius, was governor of Syria, Sloet solves by the very doubtful expedient of translating *πρώτη . . . ἡγεμονεύοντος . . . Κυρηνίου*, 'an earlier one than that made at the time of the governorship of Quirinius.' Surely Luke would have expressed such a note of time more clearly.

Gressmann's ingenious essay, *Das Weihnachtsevangelium* (Göttingen, 1914) took as the supposed pattern for the Chris-

tian nativity narrative a Jewish messianic legend, which in its turn was supposed to have come from the legend of Osiris as given by Plutarch, *De Iside et Osir.* 12. A thorough criticism of this construction, in which its weak sides are brought out, is given by *C. Clemen*, (ThStKr, 1916, 237-252). *J. Geffcken's* supposition that in the story of the shepherds figures and motives were taken over from the Mithras legend, is likely to find little acceptance, since the whole underlying notion of the analogy of the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil to the gospel story must be rejected. See Windisch, ThR, 1917, 20 f.

In contrast to these the essay of *F. Boll* is worth while. He shows that ἀστὴρ must mean a single star, not a constellation, nor a group of stars, nor even a comet. It is 'the star' of the Messiah, which arose at his birth, as in the conception of antiquity every man was born with a star. It will not be found on any astronomical chart.

The debate between *P. W. Schmiedel* and *E. Riggensbach* as to the original text of Matt. 1, 16 turns chiefly on the weight to be given to the citation of the passage by the Jew in the Dialogue between Timothy and Aquila published by Conybeare. Schmiedel deems this a genuine citation from the gospel, while Riggensbach regards it as intentional Jewish perversion, and thinks that the Christian editor accepted only the canonical text. Schmiedel gives a good classification of all extant forms of the text.

*Grosheide* discusses the text of the Sinaitic Syriac for Matthew 1, 16, accepted by von Soden, and explains it as due not to dogmatic tendency, but to the accidental error of a Greek Christian scribe, whose attention flagged after the long succession of genealogies. *J. P. van Kasteren* derives the Syriac form from the text of the Ferrar-group, where by mistake the name Joseph either was written twice or was read twice by the Syriac translator; the actual Ferrar-text is believed to be the result of dogmatic scruples. In his postscript *Grosheide* argues against the idea of a dogmatic motive, but inconclusively.

In the text of the angelic doxology of Luke 2, 14 *Harnack* decides in favor of the text in two lines and the reading εὐδοκίας.

He shows that the word *εὐδοκία* is generally used as a religious term, signifying not the 'good will' of men, but the kindly attitude of God. Harnack would connect *εὐδοκίας* and *εἰρήνη* (as Origen did) in spite of the resulting intolerable hyperbaton. See E. von Dobschütz, *ThLZ*, 1916, No. 9; J. H. Ropes, 'Good Will toward Men,' *HThR*, 1917, 52-56.

(b) *Buddhistic influence*

On the question of Buddhistic influence on the gospel tradition, *Beth* lays down the general principles to be followed. He calls for proof of actual intercourse between India and Syria in the time of the gospels, and believes that it cannot be given. In my opinion, greater caution is here necessary, and the possibility of such influence must be taken into account. In the next place *Beth* presses the question whether the gospel tradition is not more simply explained from Jewish and Palestinian conditions. This question is certainly reasonable, and is often neglected by Indic scholars. The same holds true of the principle that the investigation should not be limited to Indic material, since Egyptian or other parallels are often more pertinent. *Beth* finally concludes that no gospel story need be attributed to Indic sources. See *DLZ*, 1915, 893-901, 957-964.

*Clemen*, opposing *Garbe* (*Indien und das Christentum*) and *Edmunds*, tries to prove independence of Buddhist traditions for the material of the apocryphal as well as of the canonical gospels.

(c) *Semitisms*

*F. Schulthess* (semitist at Basel) discusses in his inaugural lecture the development and the documents of the Aramaic language. He dates the extension of Aramaic to Palestine earlier than is usual, taking the expressions 'Jewish' and 'Aramaic' in the story, 2 Kings 18, 26 ff., Is. 36, 11 ff., not literally, but as meaning 'Aramaic' and 'Assyrian.' On his view Hebrew became the ecclesiastical language much earlier; against which it may be urged that in that case it is incomprehensible that an Aramaic Targum should have arisen so late. He next treats the texts from which we can reconstruct the



Aramaic of Jesus' time (Palestinian Talmud, Midrashim, Samaritan Targum, Christian Palestinian literature); of all these new uniform editions are needed. The contrast of Judæan and Galilean he takes to refer to the difference between the written language (Judæan) and popular dialect, for he admits but trifling distinctions between the Galilean and Judæan dialects. The traces of original Aramaic in the gospels Schultze assesses lower than Wellhausen. The Semitisms are for the most part 'septuagintisms' or hebraisms. The Aramaic tinge is due rather to the Greco-palestinian Koine. The following interpretations are worthy of note. Boanerges is explained as *bene rehem, filii uteri*, 'twins.' Iscariot, after the analogy of (*i*)*stratiotes*, is either a different form of *sicarius* or a popular adaptation to a place-name. Son of Man is 'man'; the Greek form arose by the mistranslation of Dan. 7, 13 in the LXX.

(d) *Length of ministry*

To the New Testament problems at present actively discussed among Catholic scholars belongs the question of the duration of Jesus' public ministry. Two scholars, van Bebbber, 1898, and, since 1903, Belser (professor at Tübingen, † 1916) have advocated the view of a one-year ministry, but without thorough criticism of the tradition. Sharp opposition arose at once and has continued. *Meinertz* first examines the patristic tradition, here not uniform, then takes up the most important Johannine data. He rejects Belser's excision of τὸ πάσχα in John 6, 4, but approves the transposition of chapters 5 and 6, which had been adopted by other Catholic scholars; finally, the feast of John 5, 1 is identical with the passover of 6, 4, so that the ministry of Jesus as reported by John is reduced to two years (so also van Kasteren, *BiblZ*, 1915, 177).

*Hartl*, a pupil of *Meinertz*, opposes at great length the one-year hypothesis (now accepted by *Mader*); his method is to take as basis the chronological character of John, but to abandon John's chronological arrangement. It is of interest that *Hartl* counts the years of Tiberius (Luke 3, 1) from the beginning of the joint-reign, A.D. 12 (in opposition see *Dieckmann*, *Klio*, 15 339-375); also that he has been informed by the local

pastor in Nablus, that the wheat crop there begins in the middle of May, whence it follows that the event of John 4 (from 4, 35 on) took place at the beginning of February; and, finally, that he tries to make it plausible that a Galilean was not bound (as the representatives of the one-year theory assert) to make the pilgrimages, from which again it follows that in the three years Jesus may very well have failed to make some of them. In the second part Hartl attacks various theories of dislocation proposed by Catholic scholars, and argues for the strictly chronological character of the Johannine presentation.

(e) *Geography of Palestine*

A handbook to the geography of the gospels has long been needed. No one is better qualified to write it than *G. Dalman*, who in a beautiful volume with photographs and plans has brought together the results of his innumerable journeys and careful research in the Holy Land. Dalman's attitude is one of confidence in the gospel reports, although he admits minor errors. He is disposed to accept the crypt of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem as the birthplace of Jesus (in a cave), but he does not consider authentic the mention of 'the brow of the hill' (Luke 4, 29), since it does not agree with the situation of Nazareth. The ruins of the synagogue excavated at Tell Hum he assigns to a new synagogue built about A.D. 200 on the site of the older one which stood there in Jesus' time. The 'lilies of the field' he takes to refer to any large, gay wild flowers. The tradition of a second western Bethsaida (Mark 6, 45) he rejects, as he does that of Tabor for the mount of transfiguration. Emmaus of Luke 24 is identical with 'Amwâs, the statement that it was sixty miles distant from Jerusalem being neglected as inaccurate. The place of the prayer in Gethsemane he puts near the cave that is found there. The locality of the Jewish trial of Jesus must remain uncertain; but the palace of Pilate, where sentence was pronounced, is assigned to the neighborhood of the tower of David, in the western part of the town, the traditional *via dolorosa* thereby becoming impossible. Finally, with a thorough discussion, he maintains that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre occupies the cor-

rectly rediscovered site of the ancient Golgotha. See also C. Sachsse, 'Golgotha und das Praetorium des Pilatus' (ZNW 19, 1919-20, 29-38), who defends the tradition, not only for the site of Golgotha, but also in identifying the Praetorium with the Castle Antonia.

## B

(f) *Baptism and temptation*

*Gressmann's* essay on the baptism is only a sketch, now fully elaborated in a long article which appeared in AR 20, 1921, 1-40; 323-359. The significance of the legend of the baptism is the call of Jesus not as a prophet but as messiah. The dove is a royal bird, the bird of Ishtar-Atargatis. Gressmann considers the account in John, according to which John the Baptist saw what happened, to be the original form. The two forms of the voice from heaven give respectively an adoption-formula and a marriage-formula.

*A. Meyer* explains that the two accounts of the temptation, that in Mark and that in Matthew and Luke, report two entirely different events. Mark's brief mention is based on the myth of the struggle between the hero-god and the lord of darkness; while in Matthew and Luke Jesus debates like a scribe. The three Old Testament citations might well have been an earlier Jewish compilation, popularly transferred to the individual Son of God. Meyer warns against understanding the temptations too definitely as messianic. On the temptation narratives see also a Catholic dissertation, P. Ketter, *Die Versuchung Jesu nach dem Berichte der Synoptiker* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 6), xvii, 140 pp. Münster, Aschendorff, 1918.

(g) *Miracles of healing*

*Titius* has made with the assistance of technical medical works a valuable study of the expulsion of demons in the gospels. Mark and Q set a high value on the exorcisms of Jesus, while Matthew weakens their significance (cf. 7, 23), and in John, which mentions no cure of a demoniac, every part of Jesus' activity is presented as a victory over death and the devil. The physical affections in question are to be regarded as



psychoses and neuroses. In Mark 9, 14 ff. two different accounts have been confused, one of epilepsy and one of dumbness; in this instance epilepsy was not healed immediately, but its cure at a later time was assured. The illness described in Luke 13, 11 ff. is *scoliosis hysterica*, which comes suddenly and vanishes as suddenly; it can be cured by suggestive influence on the will. The dumbness of Luke 11, 14 ff. is similar. The phenomenon of demon-mania is explained as depersonalization, the idea of dual consciousness. The account in Mark 1, 23 ff. and parallels is entirely comprehensible and correct; on the other hand, the result in Mark 5, 1 ff. (the Gerasene) is improbable, since a cure usually proceeds not by a sudden discharge but by a gradual recession of the symptoms. In general Mark has made the picture conform to cruder popular ideas, perhaps under the influence of dogmatic considerations, and has thus caused the work of Jesus to resemble the exorcism of an enthusiast. Jesus must have been an exorcist of unexampled success; his work strengthened confidence in himself and in God.

The Catholic scholar *J. Jaeger* protests against such explanations of the stories of healing, and shows with interesting illustrations how elaborate and tedious is the modern procedure in cure by suggestion. But medicine is also acquainted with sudden results due to suggestion; moreover Jesus was a *religious* suggestion-healer.<sup>1</sup>

#### (h) *Sermon on the Mount*

Of the numerous essays and articles on this subject which have appeared in Germany, as elsewhere, discussing the right relation to war of a follower of Jesus, it is impossible here to give a report. See my reports on 'Jesus und der Krieg' in ThR, 1914, 1917. Studies which remain instructive since the war are:

*Eissfeldt, O.*, Krieg and Bibel (Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher). 84 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1915. — *Feine, P.*, Evangelium, Krieg und Weltfrieden. 54 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1915. — *Ihmels, L.*, Der Krieg und die

<sup>1</sup> For a mythological interpretation of Mark 6, 48, see H. Windisch, 'En hij wilde hen voorbijgaan' (NThT, 1920, 298-308).

Jünger Jesu. 64 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1916. — *Kattenbusch, F.*, Über Feindesliebe im Sinne des Christentums (ThStKr, 1916, 1-70). — *Wernle, P.*, Antimilitarismus und Evangelium. 88 pp. Basel, Helbing und Lichtenhahn, 1915. — *Plooij, D.*, Jezus en de oorlog (ThSt, 1916, 113-129).

For completeness I add two semi-popular writings which did not appear until after the war:

*Weinel, H.*, Die Bergpredigt, ihr Aufbau, ihr ursprünglicher Sinn und ihre Echtheit, ihre Stellung in der Religionsgeschichte und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt 710). 116 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1920. — *Baumgarten, O.*, Bergpredigt und Kultur der Gegenwart (Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher). 119 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1921.

Turning now to the more scientific works, the present-day problem is the scope and validity of the rigoristic teaching of the Sermon on the Mount — a problem which burns as well in the soul of the scientific investigator, and for which *F. Nügelbach* offers a solution. His key is that the Sermon on the Mount was addressed primarily to the Apostles, and set forth the conditions of their special calling. For certain parts of the Sermon this is acceptable; for Matthew's compilation as a whole it breaks down. In the Sermon, as elsewhere in Jesus' teaching, we have to distinguish between what is addressed to pious Jews and what implies a religious community of disciples separated from Judaism, and in it those precepts predominate which could only be given to persons occupying an exceptional position outside of the established social and political order. See Deissner, ThGg, 1917, 240 f.

*K. Köhler* reconstructs as follows the original form of the beatitudes as they stood in Q:

Blessed are the poor, for they shall be comforted.

Blessed are the hungry, for they shall be filled.

Blessed are they that weep, for they shall laugh.

Blessed is he whom men revile, for in like manner did they unto the prophets.

Luke has thus preserved the original form best; Matthew has added, according to Köhler, more than is usually supposed; in particular he has introduced the kingdom as a reward.

*Fiebig* discusses the originality of the saying about love to enemies in the light of the Jewish parallels. He believes the greatness of Jesus to lie in the fact that with unexampled clear-

ness and sharpness of expression he demands a boundless love, which oversteps national limits, a true love of mankind. By 'enemy' in Matt. 5, 43-48 is meant the national enemy; in 5, 38-42 the private enemy. In 5, 38 ff. Fiebig points out that the formulation is in opposition to the usual interpretation of the *jus talionis*, and is connected with the rabbinical tradition, even in the choice of examples. Luke's version is less vivid, and secondary.

*Fiebig* shows from rabbinical usage that the saying about the eye, Matt. 6, 22 f., cannot be taken as a parable, since the Jews habitually regarded the eye as affected with ethical character. In the saying Jesus warns us to look out for the eye, and remarks on its significance for the whole body.

In Matt. 7, 21, Luke 6, 46 ('Why call ye me Lord, Lord?') *K. Köhler* gives precedence to Luke; κύριε there still means 'Sir.' The form of Matt. 7, 21 is a modification of Q under the influence of Joel 3, 5 (2, 32), or more properly a protest from the side of the earnest and strict morality of a Jewish Christian against the moral laxity of the Pauline gentile Christians. The essay is important in general with reference to the development of the Kyrios-worship, the origin of which Köhler assigns to a very late date.

The 'precanonical conjecture' in the New Testament for which *Völter* argues, relates to Luke 7, 35, Matt. 11, 19, where for the incomprehensible σοφία he would substitute a supposedly original Σόδομα and add ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ before ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. He appeals to the agraphon (?) ἐδικαιώθη Σόδομα ἐκ σοῦ (Origen; Const. Ap. ii, 60) and to Ezekiel 16, 52. The consequences of this 'conjecture,' which belongs to Q and introduced the idea of wisdom, can be traced, according to *Völter*, in the addition here of the great logion (Matt. 11, 25-30) in which Jesus is represented as the personification of wisdom. *Völter* opposes Norden and the latter's assumption that here, as in Ecclus. 51 and Corp. Hermet. I, we have the same threefold scheme (prayer of thanksgiving, reception of gnosis, appeal). According to *Völter* the logion is made up directly from Ecclus. 51 and 24, but has been influenced in language by the first Hermetic tract. The whole is therefore



not a genuine utterance of Jesus, but the product of literary reflection.<sup>1</sup>

(i) *Lord's Prayer*

The Norwegian scholar *Fridrichsen*, proceeding from the strictly eschatological character of the Lord's Prayer, concludes that the first petition is not a doxology but a genuine prayer. He derives it (cf. Ezekiel) from the eschatological hallowing of the name, which God himself brings to pass by a final miracle of salvation, a deed of power against his enemies.

*Böhmer* interprets the first three petitions in almost the same way. After giving (pp. 1-167) detailed lists to show the influence of Jewish 'reverence,' that is, the fear of directly pronouncing the name of God, he proceeds to controvert the interpretation renewed by W. Neveling (*PrM*, 1916, 10-18) by which the first three prayers are taken as vows: 'We will hallow thy name; we will help establish and extend thy kingdom; we will execute thy will.' In opposition to this view *Böhmer* proves by numerous analogies that the verb 'hallow' was originally purely religious, and had God as its sole subject. The first petition then prays that God establish his position in the world as God; the second, that he become manifest as king, without reference to the coöperation of the praying worshiper; the third relates to God's saving and gracious will, in which man's part is purely passive.

P. W. Schmiedel (Zürich) and D. Völter (Amsterdam) have maintained a brisk discussion of the meaning of ἐπιούσιος. *Schmiedel* defends emphatically the translation 'bread for tomorrow,' relying on the derivation from ἡ ἐπιούσα sc. ἡμέρα and the *maḥar* of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. On the other hand, *Völter* defends the translation 'continual,' 'daily,' as the Old Syriac and Old Latin translations understood the word, and urges Matt. 6, 34, as well as the Lukan τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, which can only mean 'daily' bread, not bread 'for tomorrow'

<sup>1</sup> Völter has contributed equally ingenious and hypothetical papers on the gospels to almost every volume of *NThT.*, 'Jesus am Ölberg,' 1915, 1 ff.; 'Die Taufe Jesu durch Johannes,' 1917, 53 ff.; 'Die Versuchung Jesu,' 1917, 348 ff.; 'Die Rede Jesu über Johannes den Täufer nebst Bemerkungen zur Rede des Täufers über Jesus,' 1920, 76-95.

(cf. also NThT, 1915, 140-143). *J. Kuhn* offers the happy mediating suggestion that in Aramaic the expression was one meaning 'destined (necessary) for the coming day,' — which could be interpreted to mean 'continual,' or 'daily,' or 'for tomorrow.'

(j) *Parables*

*Kögel* tries to explain Mark 4, 12 by the formula: 'Jesus, like Isaiah, hardens the people by making intelligible to them through parables the preaching of the kingdom.' This is not tenable, for to say that the people did not believe is a different thing from saying that the parables as a mode of teaching had the purpose of hardening. See Windisch, ThR, 1917, 28-32.

A very instructive contribution to the question of what the materials were from which Jesus created his parables has been made by *Gressmann*. With the parable of Dives and Lazarus he compares a Jewish tradition, extant in various versions, and an Egyptian tale of the underworld. The former describes the death and burial of a pious man and of a publican, and the different fate of the two in the next world; the latter tells of the burial of a rich man and a poor man, and how Setme sees them again on his descent into the underworld. *Gressmann* thinks that the Jews heard the tale in Egypt, and that Jesus got it from the common stock of popular legend, but that the form of the story which the parable implies is primary as compared with the Talmudic form. The peculiarity of the gospel parable lies in the stripping off of what is fantastic and in the distinct moralization that appears in the second part (which *Gressman* considers original). See Gunkel, ThLZ, 1919, No. 9-10.

*Oort* explains the name Lazarus in our parable by the fact that among the hellenistic Greeks 'Lazarus' was the type of the oppressed and pious man (with allusion here and there to the martyr Eleazar). The more radical hypothesis of B. W. Bacon (*Hibbert Journal*, 1917), that the name specially belongs with the feast of dedication, which was Maccabean, and which he supposes to have been transformed by the evangelists (John 11) into a Christian feast, is rejected by Oort. The

Johannine story of Lazarus has in fact nothing to do with the feast of dedication.

(k) *Death of John the Baptist*

The story of Herod's feast and the death of the Baptist has also been re-examined in the light of new material. After Reimarus, *Die Stoffgeschichte der Salomedichtungen* (1913), had suggested the derivation of the narrative from a theme of the rhetorical schools (execution of a man under trial at the demand, and in the presence of, a girl), the *present reviewer* compared it with novelistic material to be found in Athenaeus xiii, 35 f. (the princess has to choose her husband at a feast). My purpose was not to suggest the derivation of the Synoptic narrative from this source, but to show that it was historically possible that the princess should appear at a banquet. With the same motive I have discussed the connection between the gospel narrative and the story of the love affairs of Xerxes (Herodotus ix, 108–113).

*P. Zondervan*, on the other hand, who includes a reply to me in his article, takes the improbable view that literary influence of Herodotus upon Mark is possible, and that the novel in Athenaeus (especially the platter motive) has affected our narrative. It is possible that legendary motives have been used in the narrative; but it is my opinion that foreign legends have been drawn on for decoration only and not for the fabric of the story; and further that legend was not elaborated in books, but in oral tradition. In an article, 'De Mythe van de wedergeboorte der Natuur bij Herodotus' (NThT, 1919, 205–240), *Zondervan* tries to prove a mythical origin of the Herod novel; see also *D. Völter* (NThT, 1921, 10 ff.), who connects the evangelist with the book of Esther; and again in reply *P. Zondervan*, 'Het boek Esther en het gastmaal van koning Herodes' (NThT, 1921, 206–217). *Dalman*, 'Zum Tanz der Tochter des Herodes' (PalJ 14, 44–46) tries to show by modern analogies that the dance of a princess at court was entirely possible.



(1) *Jesus' words to Peter*

Interesting essays are to be noted relating to the words to Peter, Matthew 16. *A. Dell* (ZNW, 1914, 1-49) explains the conceptions underlying Matt. 16, 17-19 from the point of view of the history of religions. He concludes that the utterance is the product of popular imagination occupying itself with the figure of Peter, and that in its present form it is the work of the evangelist. *Immisch*, a student of philology, tries to prove its genuineness by showing its connections with the physical features of Caesarea Philippi. Behind the city rises a high wall of rock on which stood a sanctuary (the temple of Augustus), while at the foot of the cliff was the grotto of Pan with a spring, an entrance into the lower world ('the gates of hell'). All this proves nothing. The evangelist betrays no knowledge of the location at the foot of the mountain; and the saying itself would suit Jerusalem quite as well (cliff; entrance to Hades). That the saying originated in the Aramaic-speaking primitive church is very probable.

*Harnack's* study follows a different direction. He does not undertake to trace the derivation, but to determine afresh the original text and meaning. 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against' means 'shall not die.' That cannot well be said of the church, but only of a man, that is of Peter. Either αὐτῆς refers to πέτρα (i.e. Peter) or else the original reading must have been σὺ εἰ Κηφᾶς καὶ πύλαι ᾗδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν σοῦ. But that is the text of Tatian according to Ephrem. The saying was originally a promise to Peter that he should not die before the parousia, and belongs with the similar words Mk. 9, 1; 13, 30 and John 21, 22. Harnack's argument on the textual criticism seems to me open to objection, but the idea is worth considering that the saying promises continuance until the parousia not only to the church but also to Peter. This is, in fact, the way in which both Origen and the heathen in Macarius Magnes interpret the passages to which Harnack refers. See Windisch, ThLZ, 1919, No. 17-18; J. Haussleiter, ThLBl, 1918, No. 25-26. The latter rejects the reference to Peter, as well as the reconstruction, of the text, since he cannot believe

that an interpolation originating, as Harnack thinks, in Rome could so easily have been accepted in the whole Orient. J. Sickenberger, *ThRev*, 1920, No. 1-2, holds that the reference of *αὐτῆς* to Peter is possible but less probable, and explains the text in Ephrem as deliberate alteration. See also D. Völter, *NThT*, 1921, 174-205; Bultmann, *ZNW*, 19, 165 ff.

## C

*(m) Apocalyptic discourse*

P. Corssen and D. Völter have independently made a literary analysis of the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13 and parallels with a view to ascertaining its historical significance. *Corssen* sees in the discourse a revision of a prophetic *Flugblatt*, published for the Christian community before the siege of Jerusalem, perhaps at the time of the Idumean massacres, and identifies it with the oracle mentioned by Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 5, 3. There was danger that the Christians would be drawn into the whirlpool of messianic enthusiasm; for that reason the prophet demands separation from the Jewish community. The *Flugblatt* consisted of Mk. 13, 7, 8, 12; Matt. 24, 10-12, 15-22, 23-51. The additions made by Mark were intended to adapt the apocalypse in some degree to the unexpected course of the actual events.

*Völter* takes as the kernel of the apocalyptic discourse Mk. 13, 7 f., 14-20, 24-27; he dates it earlier, in the time of the troubles under Caligula. Mark has combined this with real words of Jesus; thus Völter thinks the words Mk. 13, 1 f., 28-31 and Lk. 19, 41-44 to be a connected series of sayings in which Jesus speaks in the consciousness of being the Son of Man mentioned by Ezekiel.

*(n) Last Supper*

*R. Otto* explains the original character of the Lord's Supper by a new hypothesis (although Box, *JThSt*, 1902, had proposed something similar). He connects the Last Supper not with the passover, but with the kiddush, celebrated on the eve of the passover, at which likewise wine and bread are blessed and

distributed. The association of ideas which prompted Jesus started with the breaking of the bread; that suggested the death which threatened him, a death by stoning, in which his limbs would be broken and his blood flow.

*Schmiedel* in reply holds to the connection of the Last Supper with the passover (emphasizing the idea of the passover sacrifice); only after the destruction of Jerusalem was the kiddush set on the eve of the passover. He also defends the Synoptic account, which Otto abandons in favor of the Johannean.

The controversy shows once more the great difficulty of distinguishing the genuine from the secondary in the accounts of the Last Supper, and of catching the thoughts of Jesus and their occasion. See Windisch, *ThR*, 1917, 329–332. An attempt to ascertain the original meaning of the Last Supper by omission of certain words is made by *K. Goetz* in his latest book on the subject. The idea which he excises is that of *diatheke*. The act of Jesus must be understood as symbol and parable; it is to be thought of somewhat as Jülicher put it — as the last parable of Jesus. And it is to be observed that Jesus does not speak of his slain body, but of body (flesh) and blood, of his human person (compare the prayers in the *Didache*); in a parable he designated his human nature as food and drink for his disciples.

#### (o) *Passion and resurrection*

The enigmatic saying about the swords found only in Luke, occupied many minds during the war. *Schlatter* has devoted to it a remarkable essay, which on the whole, as it seems to me, explains satisfactorily literary form and original meaning. In opposition to most exegetes Schlatter takes the words neither metaphorically nor ironically. It is a serious piece of advice for the troublous times to come, to have a sword at hand not, as the socialist exegesis insists, to fight against the Romans, but for self-defence against bandits and assassins. Thus Schlatter denies to the saying any connection with the story of the passion, and strips it of all relation to a possible defence of Jesus by force. In my book, *Der messianische Krieg und das Ur-*



*christentum*, 1909, I proposed the hypothesis that on the way to Gethsemane Jesus had been warned to watchfulness against a threatened attack and urged to defend himself against it; and that he was brought to the decision not to use force in his own defence only by the struggle in Gethsemane. This view is, of course, only tenable if at the "Last" Supper Jesus had not yet foreseen his death and submitted to the necessity of it. See ThR, 1914, 311 f.

*M. Dibelius* has written a penetrating study of the composition and motives of the passion-narrative. He emphasizes the apologetic character of these chapters and the limited portion due to eye witnesses, in which he includes only the Last Supper, the arrest, the denial, and the crucifixion. The evangelists wanted to give a continuous and complete narrative, and consequently had to supplement their materials by their own combinations and arbitrary additions. If Luke gives a more complete account than others, it is not that he can draw on a completer and better tradition, but what we have is due to his greater literary skill and to the growth of legends. The scene 'Jesus before Herod' is to be considered legendary. It contains, as Dibelius says with some exaggeration, nothing concrete, but consists of three conventional motives — the silence of Jesus, the accusation by the high priests, and the mocking by Herod and the soldiers. All that Luke had heard was that Jesus stood before Herod, and that Pilate and Herod made common cause. Even that, however, came from the prophecy, Ps. 2, 1 f., which was interpreted of Herod and Pilate; and this interpretation, as Acts 4, 25 ff. shows, first received fixed form in a prayer used in public worship. The scene in the passion-narrative once invented, the detailed shaping was quite within Luke's power. Moreover, the episode is open to the objection that the chronology of the gospels hardly provides time for it.

In the second essay *Dibelius* pursues the investigation of Old Testament influence on the tradition of the passion and of Easter. The following narratives are derived from the theological and historical interpretation of the Old Testament: Jesus placed on the chair of the judge (Justin, *Apol.* 1, 35 and

Ev. Peter 6, cf. Is. 59, 9 f.); the parting of the garments (Ev. Petr. 12, Jn. 19, 24, cf. Psalm 22, 18). In a source used by John the following points were already included: Mary Magdalene informs the brethren of the appearance to her (cf. Psalm 22, 20); Jesus' body pierced, Jn. 19, 36 f. (cf. Zech. 12, 10, Ps. 34, 20); Jesus drinks, Jn. 19, 29 (cf. Ps. 69, 21). Dibelius points out that the Gospel of Peter is full of new traits, and that its author attaches his story to the Old Testament much more closely than is the case in the canonical gospels. That means that the later gospel still shows the more original form of the use of the Old Testament as source for evangelical tradition. Dibelius rejects the opinion that the Gospel of Peter used the Acts of Pilate.

In a very original piece of work, the only one before us dealing with the resurrection of Jesus, *F. Spitta* follows solely the method of exegesis and literary criticism. Points of view and deductions drawn from the history of religions he leaves untouched. Also the modern vision-hypothesis with its assumptions (the flight of the disciples to Galilee; Peter the first to receive a vision) is rejected. As in earlier writings, he still prefers the accounts of Luke and John, and believes that by means of a few omissions and by using the tradition of the Gospel according to the Hebrews the following series of events can be shown to be historical: By a miraculous restoration to life of the body of Jesus the grave actually became empty; Jesus was 'raised' in the same way as Lazarus or the daughter of Jairus, and he appeared again just as before, not in a transfigured celestial body. Of course the grave was neither sealed nor guarded by soldiers. A priest's servant perhaps helped him out of his grave-clothes and gave him other garments (cf. the Gospel according to the Hebrews). He first met James, then Mary Magdalene. Later he is with the disciples at Emmaus; but further miracles do not take place; his disappearance is a secret departure from the room, after which he rides back to Jerusalem. In the same manner when he comes to the disciples there assembled he does not pass through closed doors, but (like Peter, Acts 12, 6 ff.) enters after knocking and being admitted by the door-keeper. Thus

it is not a matter of appearances, but of the resumption of intercourse with his friends. The only miracle is the return to life. That had taken place during the night between Saturday and Sunday, not 'on the third day,' nor 'after three days,' — these words are derived not from the cult-myths of the death and resurrection of saviour-gods but from Hosea 6, 2 (as if that passage itself were not the precipitate of a myth).

The advantage of this reconstruction is that Spitta tries so far as possible to hold to the gospel tradition. But he finds it necessary to force his texts in order to make them suit his theory; for they imply the transfigured body of the risen Lord. The lonely traveler who all of a sudden is walking with his friends, and then disappears again equally at unawares, is a strange figure. Moreover, Spitta has no discussion of the (second) departure of Jesus. His hypothesis requires a second miracle, a translation like that of Elijah, unless Jesus, like Lazarus, died a second time (and in the deepest secrecy). In a word, Spitta's attempt breaks down, and proves anew that we must take into account visions and myths in order to explain the Easter stories. See Bultmann, *ThLZ*, 1919, No. 11-12; Deissner, *ThGg*, 1919, 187 ff.; Fiebig, *LZBl*, 1920, No. 13-14. Fiebig proposes that we apply to the Easter stories the Buddhistic theosophical experiences of the materialization and dematerialization of the body, and so reach a solution of the problems. Cf. also R. A. Hoffmann (professor at Vienna), *Das Geheimnis der Auferstehung Jesu*. 167 pp. Leipzig, 1921.

### 3. JESUS CHRIST

#### A

#### *Life of Christ*

*Wernle, P.*, *Jesus*. xv, 368 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1916. — *Loofs, F.*, *Wer war Jesus Christus?* xii, 255 pp. Halle, Niemeyer, 1916. — *Brun, L.*, *Jesu Evangelium*. xi, 640 pp. Christiania, Aschehoug, 1917. — *Schlatter, A.*, *Die Geschichte des Christus*. 544 pp. Stuttgart, Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1920. — *Lepsius, J.*, *Das Leben Jesu*. 2 Bde. 382, 380 pp. Potsdam, Tempelverlag, 1917, 1918. — *Mehlhorn, P.*, *Wahrheit und Dichtung im Leben Jesu (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt 137)*. 2. Aufl. 130 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1919.



## B

*Jesus' conception of himself*

*Frövig, A.*, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu als Lehrer und Wundertäter nach Markus und der sogenannten Redequelle untersucht. 263 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1918. — *Völter, D.*, Die Menschensohnfrage neu untersucht. 56 pp. Leiden, Brill, 1916. — *Kuhnert, E.*, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (ZNW 18, 1917-18, 165-176). — *Bultmann, R.*, Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-bekenntnis (ZNW 19, 1919-20, 165-174).

## C

*Jesus' ethics, and use of the Old Testament*

*Grimm, E.*, Die Ethik Jesu. 2. Aufl. 343 pp. Leipzig, Heinsius, 1917. — *Preisker, H.*, Die Ethik der Evangelien und die jüdische Apokalyptik (dissertation). 70 pp. Breslau, 1915. — *Preisker, H.*, Die Art und Tragweite der Lebenslehre Jesu (ThStKr, 1919, 1-45). — *Hänel, J.*, Der Schriftbegriff Jesu. Studie zur Kanongeschichte und religiösen Beurteilung des Alten Testaments (BFTh 24). 224 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1919.

## A

*Life of Christ*

The book of *P. Wernle* is the best detailed, scholarly, and yet popular exposition of the teaching and character of Jesus that we have in German. It has, as the preface explains, two deliberate aims, — exactness of philological and historical criticism and religious understanding. The author now puts the main emphasis on the latter, admitting that he formerly overestimated the value of purely scientific and technical study in this field. It is indeed to undertake the infinite, if it be our aim to comprehend the personality of Jesus. Wernle has in general escaped the risk of obscuring the historical point of view through interest in the religious understanding. He insists that the story of Jesus is by no means 'edifying,' and the strangeness and drastic harshness of Jesus are not concealed in his portrayal.

He begins with a sketch of 'Volkstum und Eigenart,' which sets forth Jesus' Old Testament faith, and his individuality in contrast to contemporary Judaism. The teaching of Jesus is described under the topics, belief in God, man and God's requirements, the message of the coming kingdom of God.

In Jesus' attitude to the Jewish Law, Wernle emphasizes the sharper, enhanced, more absolute quality shown in Jesus' requirements. In discussing the source of these, not ascetic but heroic, commands, Wernle for the most part neglects the concrete, eschatological situation which gave them their occasion, and prefers to associate them with Jesus' deep experience of God. Jesus' attitude to the Roman state is marked by two points of view: on the one side the duty of political obedience, with brusque rejection of everything revolutionary; on the other, the exaltation of religious duty, of the love of God and yearning for the kingdom of God, raised far above anything political. Wernle's presentation of the signs of the kingdom of God and the conditions of its coming is admirable. As to the date of the coming of the kingdom he distinguishes neutral utterances, sayings which represent it as near, and expressions which indicate its present realization. He sees no reason for denying originality to any one of these groups; although the 'catastrophic' idea may have been the interpretation of a later day. In any case the kingdom will not come through our efforts. Wernle's emphasis on the bearing of the one (so Mark and Matthew) genuine word from the cross deserves mention. In the last chapter he admits that Jesus regarded himself as the messiah, but with a novel conception under which he presented himself as one trusted by the Father and sent to help his brethren. Throughout the book the effort is manifest to relieve the teaching and person of Jesus of contemporary, human traits, and to translate them into the sphere of the eternal. See E. Tröltsch, *ThLZ*, 1916, No. 3; Jülicher, *ChrW*, 1915, No. 48; Windisch, *ThR*, 1917, 42 ff.; Feine, *ThLBl*, 1916, No. 4.

The book of *F. Loofs* is a translation of his Haskell Lectures, *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* (New York, Scribners, 1913). Wernle's book, which Loofs does not wholly agree with, is the occasion of the publication in German. Loofs's main thesis, namely, that the assumption that the life of Jesus was purely human can be proved incorrect, historically and theologically, seems to me defective. He directs his arguments only against the antiquated 'liberal' account of Jesus and the ex-

treme eschatological Jesus; but his acute and thoughtful criticism deserves attention. See Windisch, ThR, 1917, 49-58; Knopf, ThLZ, 1917, No. 11.

The work of the Norwegian scholar *L. Brun* is heavily weighted with learning. The author lays great stress on the relation of the gospel of Jesus to later Judaism, and in every chapter introduces a comparison of later Jewish views of the subject in hand. He takes in general a mediating position.

*Schlatter* has published a new edition of the first volume ('Das Wort Jesu') of his Theology of the New Testament (1909). The new title, 'Geschichte des Christus,' indicates that Schlatter aims to portray not the so-called Jesus of history but the Christ of the four gospels; it also implies that in order to understand this Christ the student must not limit himself to a bare statement of his teachings but must realize the unity of doctrine and deed. The sections of the earlier work are largely reproduced, but in different order and generally with considerable alteration. The spirit of the work is the same as before; Synoptic and Johannine tradition and conception unite to form one harmonious stream. Schlatter has a good acquaintance with later Judaism and constantly weaves this knowledge into his history. He is a very suggestive theologian, although his reflections ought not to be accepted as if they were critical historical interpretation.

*F. Lepsius'* romance is included here because the author is a thoroughly trained theologian, and the book everywhere shows his acquaintance with the critical problems. The poetic reconstruction itself is interesting to the scholar, for the artistic intuition of the romance-writer has infused fresh dramatic vitality into the brief narratives of the evangelists. The writer's personal knowledge of the Orient is apparent in every chapter. See Mehlhorn, PrM, 1919, No. 7-8; Deissner, ThGg, 1919, 183 ff.

The little book of *P. Mehlhorn* (†), in which the author attempted to distinguish sharply between truth and poetry in the gospel tradition according to the principles of modern scholarship and liberal theology, has appeared in a revised edition.



## B

*Jesus' conception of himself*

The Norwegian *A. Frøvig* has given a very conservative detailed treatment of the 'self-consciousness' (*Selbstbewusstsein*) of Jesus. In the discussion of Jesus as teacher the word *ἐξουσία*, which marks his contrast to the scribes and Pharisees, is explained as the possession of a higher power which was the source of Jesus' independent attitude toward tradition and the Bible. Frøvig conceives of Jesus' consciousness of his own nature as prophetic, as super-prophetic, and as messianic. He lets the eschatological expectation drop out of Jesus' circle of ideas, although the conquest of Satan was a main element in the messianic office as Jesus conceived it. In spite of restricting himself to the Synoptic tradition, the author is forced to assume for that tradition a basis of what are in fact Johannine ideas, and it is not surprising that the discussion brings up at last not with a contrast but with a unity between Jesus' ideas and the faith of the church. See M. Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1919, No. 19-20.

Völter's essay is a reproduction and defence of the idea brought forward in his *Jesus der Menschensohn oder das Berufsbewusstsein Jesu*, 1914 (see also *NThT*, 1915), that Jesus' idea of himself as Son of Man was derived from Ezekiel. By the connection in the story of Zacchaeus (which is a doublet of the calling of Levi) of the vocation of the Son of Man with forgiveness, he establishes an analogy to the vocation of the 'Son of Man' in Ezekiel, and he then proceeds to argue that in the Sermon on the Mount, the parables, and the cleansing of the temple Jesus follows the pattern of Ezekiel. The ingenious argument is unconvincing.

*E. Kuhnert* quite wrongly explains the term Son of Man to mean 'benefactor, or saviour, of mankind,' arguing from the Greek inscriptions which designate a benefactor as *υἱὸς πόλεως*, *υἱὸς λαοδικέων*, *υἱὸς Ἑλλάδος*, etc. See E. Hertlein, *ZNW* 19, 1919-20, 46-48.

*Bultmann*, following and supplementing Wrede's studies, raises anew doubts as to the soundness of the tradition of the

title Son of Man. The fact that belief in Jesus' messiahship arose after his death has, he holds, left positive traces in the tradition, notably in the 'messianic secret' and in Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi. The former was intended to explain why the people did not accept the apostolic preaching, and also why the Apostles themselves had not recognized until after the resurrection that Jesus was the messiah. In Peter's confession the pericope in Mark is secondary, being both prompted by partisan animosity against Peter and in its present form mutilated. The words addressed to Peter in Matthew are an integral part of the pericope, and Bultmann infers that the whole scene is the invention of the early church. Using the singular agreement between Matt. 16, 17 f. and Gal. 1, 15 f., he concludes that the conversation with Peter also relates to an Easter vision and that in Mk. 8, 27-30 it is the risen Christ who speaks, as well as in Matt. 18, 15-20, cf. also John 20, 22 f.; 21, 15-19.

Bultmann's argument is not wholly convincing, but is striking. Yet it is nowhere stated in the gospels that the messiahship was directly concealed from the disciples. Moreover, in the narrative the exact fixing of the locality remains impressive as against the idea that the whole scene is the product of later thought; the note of place (Mk. 8, 27a) cannot be connected with the preceding pericope. It may well be that an historical narrative and a resurrection-story are here combined; in any case the full credibility of the pericope is shaken.

## C

### *Jesus' ethics, and use of the Old Testament*

*Grimm*, a liberal pastor, has written for educated laymen with lucidity and careful thought. In this 2d edition some discussions suggested by the War have been added.

The Breslau dissertation of *H. Preisker* is an able investigation of the relation of the ethics of the gospels to Jewish apocalyptic. The influence of the apocalypses on Jesus is to be seen in the effect exerted by eschatology on his moral teaching, which is traced in a variety of aspects. Also the attitude of

Jesus as to the validity of the Law is prepared for by the apocalyptic writers, who reject Pharisaic formalism, emphasize such virtues as purity, humility, and love of one's neighbor, and reflect on the origin of sin, while on the other hand they do not touch the question of the source of power for the fulfillment of the commandments. But there are also differences, — the drastic and heroic quality of Jesus' requirements, the setting aside of the ritual precepts, the universalism of the law of love, the conviction that the kingdom of God is already coming. Jesus purified and deepened Jewish moral teaching; in the ethics of the later church Jewish influence grew stronger. Preisker does not extend his inquiry to the ethics of the Old Testament prophets or of the wisdom-literature.

In *Preisker's* second essay the new and exalted elements of Jesus' teaching are much more strongly emphasized, and it is urged that these were due not to apocalyptic doctrine but to the personal character of Jesus, which produced an ethical teaching of intensified religious individualism, that took hold of, and deepened, the eschatology.

*Hänel's* book begins with an inquiry into the contents of the Old Testament as implied by Jesus' sayings, followed by a minute investigation of the text of his quotations, from which the author concludes that he used a targumic popular Bible. In the second part Hänel discusses at length from all possible sides Jesus' mode of using the Scriptures, and tries, without much success, to construct a formula which will cover both his subjection to the Scriptures and his attitude of superiority to them. See Deissner, ThGg, 1920, 6, 223 f.

### III. THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS

#### A

*Erbes, P.*, Der Jünger, welchen Jesus lieb hatte (ZKG 36, 283-318). — *Zickendraht, K.*, Ist Lazarus der Lieblingsjünger des vierten Evangeliums? (SchwThZ, 1915, 49-54). — *Larfeld, W.*, Die beiden Johannes von Ephesus. 186 pp. München, Beck, 1914. — *Soltau, W.*, Das vierte Evangelium in seiner Entstehungsgeschichte dargelegt (SAH, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1916). 39 pp. — *Stange, E.*, Die Eigenart der johanneischen Produktion (dissertation). 66 pp. Dresden, 1914. — *Schniewind, J.*, Die Parallelperikopen bei Lukas und Johannes (Habilitationsschrift). 100 pp. Leipzig, 1914. — *Har-nack, A. von*, Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes (SAB, 1915, 534-573).



## B

*Wetter, G. P.*, "Der Sohn Gottes." Eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannes-Evangeliums (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, N. F. 9). 200 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1916. — *Wetter, G. P.*, "Ich bin es." Eine johanneische Formel (ThStKr, 1915, 224–238). — *Wetter, G. P.*, "Ich bin das Licht der Welt" (Beiträge zur Religionswissenschaft I, 2, 1913–14, 166–201). — *Wetter, G. P.*, Eine gnostische Formel im 4. Evangelium (ZNW 18, 49–63). — *Lütgeri, W.*, Die johanneische Christologie. 2. Aufl. xi, 270 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1916. — *Monse, F. X.*, Johannes und Paulus (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 5). 213 pp. München, Aschendorff, 1915.

## C

*Apocalypse*

*Boll, F.*, Aus der Offenbarung Johannis. Hellenistische Studien zum Weltbild der Apocalypse (Stoicheia 1). viii, 151 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1914. — *Clemen, C.*, Die Bildlichkeit der Offenbarung Johannis (Festgabe für J. Kaftan, 25–43). Tübingen, Mohr, 1920. — *Hadorn, W.*, Die Zahl 666, ein Hinweis auf Trajan (ZNW 19, 1919–20, 11–29).

## A

*Erbes*, completing an earlier study (ZKG, 1912, 159 ff.), argues that the beloved disciple, whom he identifies with the Elder John of Papias and of the Johannine epistles, was the 'rich young man' (Mk. 10, 17–22), and was, further, the same as the 'young man' of Mk. 14, 51. He accepts the tradition of the martyrdom of the Apostle John, and (rejecting the conjecture of Larfeld) holds the first mention of John in the list of Apostles in the Papias fragment to be an interpolation.

The Swiss, *K. Zickendraht*, thinks that Lazarus, the other person in the gospels of whom it is said that Jesus loved him, is the beloved disciple. See R. Steck (SchwThZ, 1915, 91–94), who rejects the suggestion.

*Larfeld* has written a very careful investigation of the notice of Papias about the Presbyter John. His conclusion is that since the John mentioned with Aristion is not the previously named Apostle John, the appellation, 'the disciples of the Lord,' cannot apply to the two former names, and he conjectures, in consideration of what is known about the abbreviations of *nomina sacra*, that  $\overline{KT}$  arose from  $\overline{ICOT}$ , and that

from an original  $\overline{\text{IΩΤ}}$  (i.e. 'Ιωάννου). But the Apostle probably wrote the main gospel, the Elder John (with Aristion) chapter 21.

*Soltau's* analysis of the gospel is highly complicated. Like Wendt and Spitta, he distinguishes narratives and discourses, but the former were slowly formed into the Corpus which now makes the foundation of our gospel, while the discourses were not introduced before ca. 140. He emphasizes the point that the discourses are devoid of all relation to the narratives and are closely related to one another; their independent origin is also indicated by Ignatius, who is acquainted with them, but not with the gospel as a whole. Their home was therefore Antioch. They are developed from Synoptic material, especially parables, but are differentiated from the Synoptics by their higher christology. The share of the Apostle John is limited to certain Johannine legends which came from him orally. The Elders, especially the Elder John, also took part in the composition. Soltau's division of the narrative material into Johannine, Synoptic, and anti-synoptic (that is, legends which were intended to correct or rival Synoptic traditions) is instructive, also his hypothesis that the discourses, like the Synoptic 'logia,' formed a distinct book. The study is a comprehensive sketch; for individual proofs see ThStKr, 1915, 371 ff. and ZNW, 1915, 24-54; 1916, 49-69.

Into the discussion of the Fourth Gospel a new point of view is brought by *E. Stange*, with his idea of a psychological explanation of the Johannine diction. John, he says, was expressly inclined to isolative apperception. Stange describes elaborately, and in general correctly, the Johannine style, with its repetitions, recapitulations, fondness for definitions (positive and negative), lack of capacity for swift, logical connected thought, and other characteristics. *Bultmann*, in his review (ThLZ, 1916, 532 ff.), points out that certain linguistic peculiarities in John pertain to vulgar usage, but are favorite phrases with John. To Bultmann's further suggestion that all this might apply to a school or an intellectual atmosphere, it may be replied that while single elements of the Johannine style recall the solemn style of hellenistic syncretism, and while the

style of John could be imitated by interpolators, yet in the New Testament it stands unique and implies a definite individual behind it. Moreover, it is not necessary to believe that all the discourses in John came in continuous flow from the author's pen.

*Schniewind* has examined at length the parts of John which seem parallel to Luke, and argues that the parallelisms are not of literary origin but are due to the common use of a narrative tradition, especially to be detected in the history of the passion. His proof is inadequate; the parallels, mostly single traits and phrases, may often be referred to the independent working of common apologetic and literary motives.

*Harnack* studies the text and meaning of some difficult passages in the gospel and epistles of John, with the incidental purpose of illustrating the importance of the text of the Vulgate. In 1 John 5, 18, in place of the difficult  $\delta \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma \epsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \upsilon \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$  (as applied to Christ a phrase without parallel), he would read  $\eta \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \sigma \iota \varsigma \epsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \upsilon \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$ , which makes sense and is the reading of the Vulgate (as well as of Chromatius and of at least two Greek minuscules). He discusses John 1, 13 with its alleged allusion to the virgin-birth. As it stands, the sentence can refer only to Christ, but in the present context it is awkward. Harnack thinks it to be an originally singular, very old, christological gloss, which was either prefixed to 1, 14 while still in the singular and without relative pronoun, or else was appended to 1, 13 after being changed to the plural. In John 1, 33 f. Harnack decides for  $\delta \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \varsigma$ , as a messianic appellation of Jewish theology, and in 1 John 4, 2 f. for  $\lambda \upsilon \epsilon \iota$ . He warns against the omission of 1 John 2, 1 f.  $\omega \varsigma \text{ (καί) } \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \varsigma$  (or  $\delta \theta \epsilon \omicron \varsigma$ )  $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \iota \epsilon \iota \varsigma \tau \omicron \nu \alpha \iota \omega \nu \alpha$ , which is found in the Sahidic and in some Latin witnesses. In 1 John 2, 20 he accepts  $\pi \acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$  instead of  $\pi \acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ , and in 1 John 3, 10 prefers  $\delta \mu \eta \omega \nu \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \omicron \varsigma$  ( $\Psi$  vg Orig latt syr) to the usual  $\delta \mu \eta \pi \omicron \iota \omega \nu \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \omicron \sigma \acute{\upsilon} \nu \eta \nu$ . Finally, in 1 John 5, 17 he would omit  $\omicron \upsilon$  (with vg Tert pesh arm), whereby an effective conclusion is gained. In an appendix Harnack argues that the *comma johanneum* is the post-augustinian revision of an old addition to the text.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On the *comma johanneum* cf. also A. Bludau, 'Das Comma johanneum bei den Griechen' (BiblZ, 1915, 26-50; 130-162; 222-243).

## B

*Wetter* has an excellent knowledge of syncretistic mythology and piety; and of all the recent discussions of the theological character of John his are the most important. His main thesis is that the hellenistic syncretistic theology had a doctrine of the Son of God, who comes down from heaven, works as teacher of the human race, as revealer of God, as doer of miracles, as redeemer, as restrainer and conqueror of the magi, and who ascends into heaven; and that this figure is in John united with that of Christ, with a polemic aim against the heathen representatives of this doctrine. While the Johannine portrait of Christ uses, both in general and in the discourses, many motives of the syncretistic figure of the saviour (especially in the soteriological sayings introduced by 'I am'), at the same time the purpose is to disparage all heathen saviour-worship and to exalt the Christ of the church as the only true Saviour.

*Wetter's* book continues *Bousset's* work and applies his ideas to John. He reproduces the syncretistic material more fully than did *Bousset*, although he pays strangely little attention to the saviour-gods of the mysteries. His evidence that many traits of the Johannine Christ can be explained from the syncretistic environment is convincing; but qualification is necessary, for Hellenism ought not to be so sharply contrasted with Judaism and the Old Testament. Most of the predicates in John are connected with Old Testament and Jewish terms and traditions; the Jewish messiah is one type of ancient faith in a saviour, and before the time of John the messiah was occasionally depicted by the aid of syncretistic motives. The same is true of the figure of Jesus in the Synoptics, at an earlier period than that of the Fourth Gospel. The first disciples probably viewed Jesus in the light of syncretistic ideas of a saviour, so that in John the process was merely carried farther, and given a telling literary expression. As to the polemic purpose of the gospel, the thought of heathen 'substitute saviours' must have been only incidental; in general the evangelist betrays no consciousness of it. See M. Dibelius, *DLZ*, 1918, No. 20-21; Windisch, *ThT*, 1917, 244 ff.; W. Bauer, *ThLZ*, 1918,



No. 23-24; A. Loisy, RC, November 1919; Deissner, ThGg, 1917, 246 ff.

In the formula *ἐγὼ εἰμι* *Wetter* finds a 'name' hinted at which comprehends the divinity of Christ, a view which he supports by evidence from outside the Bible. In 'I am the light of the world,' he sees a formula the meaning of which can be discovered from the hellenistic religious literature, where 'light' is the name for a saving and revealing religious entity, and thus a term with a sense already established, and that could be applied to Jesus. 'I know whence I come and whither I go,' *Wetter* thinks to be a gnostic formula current in mystical circles, where knowledge of one's own origin and destiny, that is, of one's own nature, was a constituent element in religious gnosis.

*Lütgert's* monograph (a thoroughly revised new edition) follows completely the method imposed by biblical 'literalism.' It covers the whole range of Johannine ideas, as is entirely suitable in view of the central importance of Christ in the doctrine of the Fourth Gospel. In spite of his refusal to recognize any relation of the Gospel of John to the thought of its time, *Lütgert's* simple presentation of Johannine doctrine is valuable.

The Catholic chaplain *Monse* has not solved the problem of 'John and Paul,' but he presents the most important material well arranged, and puts together conveniently the Johannine parallels to Paul and the Pauline parallels to John. See *Windisch*, ThLZ, 1916, No. 4; *Feine*, ThLBl, 1915, No. 24.<sup>1</sup>

## C

### *Apocalypse*

The understanding of the apocalyptic cosmology of the Book of Revelation has been distinctly advanced by the philologist *F. Boll*. His book was written before the War, but the failure of R. H. Charles to use it in his Commentary will justify an account of its contents and importance here. *Boll's* chief contribution is the proof that the Apocalypse owes its figures and material not to the distant Orient but to its own hellenistic

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also *Rol. Schütz*, *Die Vorgeschichte der johanneischen Formel ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν* (dissertation). Göttingen, Hubert, 1917.

environment, which of course was subject to strong oriental influence. Boll's explanation of the prophecies of woes in the Apocalypse from the catalogues of catastrophes found in the hellenistic astrological texts seems to me to produce a series of highly important analogies, not to point to a derivation. More sagacious is his interpretation of the fundamental motives of the apocalyptic picture of the universe, especially in the numbers, as due to hellenistic cosmology. In particular he seeks to show the connection of the apocalyptic phenomena and processes with the starry heavens and ancient astrology. Some examples of this may be given: the sea of glass (15, 2) may be the Milky Way; the altar (6, 9) is a constellation in the southern heavens (his further inferences here are improbable); the twenty-four elders are twenty-four stars which Diodorus Siculus ii, 31, 4 terms 'judges of the worlds'; the four beasts are four constellations; the heavenly Jerusalem is the cosmic heaven with the twelve signs of the zodiac and the Milky Way, etc. In chapter 12 the virgin and the dragon are constellations; the proximate mythical model Boll finds in Isis, who is likewise identified with the constellation Virgo. Boll here argues for a Christian, not a Jewish, origin for the chapter. Boll's studies have brought him to the conclusion that the Apocalypse is a stylistic unity and can not be analyzed into a variety of component sources, since the same astrological notions are carried through all parts of the book.

That all these explanations require to be tested is shown by *C. Clemen* (NJkIA, 1915, 26-43). Clemen would identify the sea of glass, not with the heavenly ocean, but with the primeval sea (Tiâmat), and doubts whether the 'lamb' is the constellation Aries. He is also skeptical both as to the constellation Virgo and the figure of Isis, and in opposition to Boll holds on to the Jewish origin of the source of chapter 12; and thinks that Boll exaggerates the influence of hellenistic astrology on the Apocalypse. Nevertheless Heitmüller has done well to include some of these suggested derivations of apocalyptic ideas in the new edition of J. Weiss's commentary on the Book of Revelation in 'Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt.'

*D. Völter* (PrM 21, 39–51) has also broken a lance with Boll over chapter 12 of the Apocalypse. While admitting that the Isis-myth underlies the imagery, he contends that the combination of the mother of the messiah with Parthenos-Isis was suggested by Is. 7, 14 and Micah 4, 8–10; the woman in heaven is like the heavenly Jerusalem, Gal. 4, 26; the myth was intended to deny the incarnation of Christ and hence was composed by the docetist Cerinthus. See A. Meyer, ThR, 1915, 204 ff.; W. Bousset, ThLZ, 1915, No. 12 (with valuable additions to the discussion); W. Bauer, DLZ, 1915, No. 36.

*C. Clemen* has written also on the 'imagery' of Revelation. He counts up all the designations and descriptions in the book which are certainly figurative, and argues that they are all so dependent on transmitted tradition, and in many cases are so self-contradictory, that they must have been not 'seen' but 'invented.' But such inconsistencies and obscurities actually occur in dreams.

*Hadorn* (professor at Bern) proposes a new interpretation of 666. *θηρίον* in Hebrew letters yields 666, but what did *θηρίον* mean? Hadorn suggests the name (of similar sound) 'Trajan,' or rather the family name of the emperor, *Οὔλιος*, which also yields (in Greek) 666. Trajan is the eighth head, if you reckon from Nero and leave out Galba. The reference to Nero (in Hebrew letters) may also have been in the back of the apocalyptic writer's mind; in that case he would have thought that Trajan was Nero redivivus. See Heitmüller, ThLZ 45, 57 f.

#### IV. ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

##### A

*Zahn, Th.*, Die Urausgabe der Apostelgeschichte des Lucas (Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons 9). 401 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1916. — *Wellhausen, J.*, Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte (AGW, Phil.-hist. Klasse, N.F. 15). 56 pp. Berlin, Weidmann, 1914. — *Zahn, Th.*, Das dritte Buch des Lukas (NkZ, 1917, 373–395). — *Van den Bergh van Eysinga, G. A.*, De geneesherr Lucas; Lucas en Josephus; De evangeliegeschiedenis als bron der handelingen; Lucas' doel met de uitgave der handelingen (NThT, 1916, 228–250; 1917, 141–150; 1918, 212–222; 1919, 366–384). — *Greidanus, S.*, Doel van de Handelingen der Apostelen (GerefThT 20, 1920, 345–362, 385–396). — *Frölich, R.*, Das Zeugnis der Apostelgeschichte von Christus und das religiöse Denken in Indien (Arbeiten für Missionswissenschaft 2). 74 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1918.

## B

*Schmidt, K. L.*, Die Pfingsterzählung und das Pfingstereignis (Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentums 1). 36 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1919. — *Schmiedel, P. W.*, Pfingsterzählung und Pfingstereignis (PrM 24, 73–86). — *Mentz, A.*, Die Zusammenkunft der Apostel in Jerusalem und die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte (ZNW 18, 1917, 177–195). — *Völter, D.*, Der Bericht über das Apostelconcil in Act. 15 nach der Auffassung von W. Bousset (NThT, 1915, 123–140). — *Brun, L.*, Apostelkonzil und Aposteldekret (NoTT, 1920, 1–52). — *Venetianer, L.*, Die Beschlüsse zu Lydda und das Apostelkonzil zu Jerusalem (Festschrift für Ad. Schwarz, 417–423). Berlin, 1917. — *Weinreich, O.*, De dis ignotis quaestiones selectae (AR, 1915, 1–52). — *Dölger, F. J.*, “Dem gemeinsamen Gott” (Missionsblätter für Studierende und Gebildete 6, 6–11).

## A

The most important recent work on Acts, and a contribution of lasting value, is unquestionably *Zahn's* attempt to reconstruct the oldest Latin version and then the ‘Western’ Greek text. The result is far and away superior to the ‘Western’ texts of Blass and Hilgenfeld. Few will agree that these texts of Zahn represent the actual first edition of Luke himself, but in any case Zahn has put together (though of course not in every detail) a definite second-century recension. To the Latin text Zahn has added detailed text-critical notes and a glossary, and to the Greek text similar notes; both series often treat of matters of exegesis. Each text is provided with a full apparatus, very conveniently organized and easily used, and of extraordinary accuracy, although there are occasional slips, not always corrected later in the volume, and the amazing trustworthiness of Tischendorf’s *Editio octava* still holds its primacy. In some cases in the later chapters the statements and views of the ‘Urausgabe’ are corrected or modified in the notes of Zahn’s Commentary on Acts, which this textual volume is designed to accompany. For the Latin Zahn has used the newly discovered ‘*Prophetiae ex omnibus libris collectae*,’ from which he takes into the Greek as well as the Latin text the variant (13, 2) *Lucius Cyrenaeus qui manet usque adhuc*; he naturally regards this as a proof that the ‘Western’ recension goes back to Luke himself. Zahn recognizes the defects of Codex Bezae, from which (and from the Latin) he departs in the Apostolic



decree, adopting the oriental text. He also makes justified use of the margin of the Harclean Syriac, as representing an Old Syriac version of Acts prior to the Peshitto; his reasons here are open to question, but his result is probably sound. See Leipoldt, ThLBl 37, 441-444; Hans von Soden, DLZ, 1921; W. Bauer, ThR, 1917, 117-122 (with detailed criticism); Sick-enberger, BiblZ, 1917, 373.

*Wellhausen's* analysis of Acts was the last work on the New Testament of that great scholar († 1917). It was finished in 1911, but not published until 1914. His 'Noten zur Apostel-geschichte' (1907) are embodied in the later publication. Well-hausen pays special heed to 'seams and joints,' seeks to detect sources, points out doublets, etc. In the chronology he follows E. Schwartz. His theory is interesting that both in the story of the riot at Ephesus and in the account of Paul's voyage nar-ratives of entirely different origin have been transferred to the history of Paul. The paper is full of acute remarks, often sea-soned with Attic salt. See Windisch, DLZ, 1917, No. 24; W. Bauer, ThR, 1917, 116 f.

*Zahn* in his article brings to bear many good arguments for the view that Luke intended to write a third book, not so much the use of *πρῶτον*, Acts 1, 1, as the recountal of all the topics omitted in Acts which could furnish the material for a third volume, — the travels of the other Apostles, the trial of Paul in the emperor's court, the fate of the Palestinian Christians in the Jewish war, and the course of the divine judgment.

*G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga*, the most important follower of van Manen, and representative of the radical New Testament school in Holland, attacks Harnack's position in favor of the tradition, and seeks to establish the radical theory of the origin of Acts. He explains from 2 Tim. 4, 11 the tradi-tion that Luke wrote Acts. The notion that the author of Acts exhibits the result of medical training he criticises keenly and wittily, reaching the same conclusion as that to which Cad-bury's learned discussion has since brought scholars. He also endeavors, following Krenkel, to prove that Luke was ac-quainted with Josephus, laying special weight upon the parallels in Josephus to Acts 5, 36 f.; 11, 28 f.; 25, 11; 23, 22 f. In the

subsequent article (1918) he shows how Luke frequently employs motives taken from the Gospels to embellish the narrative in Acts and to magnify the Apostles, as in Acts 9, 36-43; 3, 2-10; 16, 8-13; 7, 59 f.; 6, 13 f. Finally, he endeavors to define the purpose of Acts in the line of the post-Tübingen criticism: Luke meant to show how Christianity came from Jerusalem to Rome and from the Jews to the gentiles and at the same time to prove on the one hand the political harmlessness of the Christians and on the other the reprobateness of the Jews. From these motives it follows that the book was composed in the time of Hadrian. See also the article by the same author "Dubletten in Handelingen," NThT, 1921, 274-300.

In opposition to these views *Greidanus* tries to give a more theological definition of the purpose of Acts: Acts described the carrying on of the work of Jesus in the Apostolic Church and the history of the Apostolic "testimony concerning Jesus Christ."

The Leipzig missionary *Frölich* contributes to the growing literature which aims to gain illumination on New Testament problems from missionary experience. He treats of a large number of significant points running through the Book of Acts, and sets the Apostles' narratives in the light of the experiences and conflicts of Christian missions in India. His themes are: the office of the Apostles as witnesses; Christian and Indian love of truth (on Acts 1); the history of Jesus as it is attested by Peter and experienced in India (on Acts 2); the Master and the Gurus (on Acts 3-5); the work of the Servant of Jehovah (on Acts 7-8); the reality of the forgiveness of sins (on Acts 10 and 13); natural revelation and the gospel (on Acts 16 and 17); "the words of truth and soberness" and the fulfilment of the prophetic words (on Acts 26).

*K. L. Schmidt* endeavors by the aid of the psychology of religion to give grounds for a more favorable judgment on the historical character of the narrative of the events at Pentecost, contending that the narrative of Acts 2 is but a slightly exaggerated account of an occasion of 'collective ecstasy,' in which the assembled Jews and proselytes were profoundly affected by the glossolalia (not exactly like that of 1 Corinthians) of the

Apostles. He interprets the text as meaning not that the speakers spoke foreign languages, but that the foreign hearers received a miraculous impression. See Bultmann, ThLZ, 1920, No. 17-18. *Schmiedel* with good reason contests Schmidt's explanation, and shows that the legendary influences in Acts 2 are stronger than Schmidt thinks.

*A. Mentz* analyzes Acts 15 into two sources: (1) M, 11, 27-28; 11, 29-30; 12, 25; 13, 2-14, 28; (2) V, (13, 1) 15, 1; 15, 2-21; 15, 22-35; 15, 41-16, 6, thus identifying the two journeys to Jerusalem of chapter 11 and chapter 15. The council took place in A.D. 44. He has a peculiar theory that Symeon (Acts 15, 14) was not Simon Peter but Symeon Niger (Acts 13, 1).

*L. Brun* thinks that Paul did not feel personally bound by the decree, although out of consideration for the authorities and other Jewish Christians in Jerusalem he allowed it to be issued without protesting against it. He was later embarrassed by this attitude, and consequently is silent on the subject in Galatians. But from Gal. 2, 3-5; 2, 6 we may infer that he had made concessions to others, and that on these others some requirement had been imposed.

*Völter* strikes out from Acts 15 the speech of Peter and the provisos of James as later additions, and identifies the journey of chapter 15 with that of chapter 11. He supposes that the author deliberately inserted the journey to Asia Minor (Acts 13 and 14) in the middle of the account of the journey to Jerusalem which he found in his source. The latter account began with Acts 11, 27-30, and continued in what is now Acts 15, 3 ff. The journey to Asia Minor was really subsequent to the Apostolic Council.

*L. Venetianer* compares the Apostolic Council with the decisions of Jewish rabbis at Lydda during the persecution under Hadrian, and regards as the model for the provisos of James the rule that a Jew has the duty of accepting martyrdom only in the three cases of compulsion to idolatry, incest, or murder. See BiblZ 14, 374.

*O. Weinreich*, in connection with the passage from Philostratus adduced by E. Norden as source for Paul's speech on Mars' Hill, discusses various testimonies and inscriptions con-

nected with the theme of the 'unknown gods,' namely, Pausanias i, 17, 1 (on the notable piety of the Athenians); altars for new gods; Jerome on Tit. 1, 12; the inscriptions with ἄγνωστοι θεοί (always in the plural); Pap. Giss. No. 3 ἤκω σοι . . . οὐκ ἄγνωστος Φοῖβος θεός, etc.

Dölger adds one inscription in the singular: κοινῷ θεῷ (Tunis, second century), which, he thinks, assures the possibility of an inscription ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ. The 'unknown god' may have been a mystery-divinity which was unknown to the uninitiated. Dölger denies dependence of Acts on Philostratus, since the source of the biography of Apollonius owed its origin to the sun-worship of the third century. See BiblZ 15, 184.

## V. PAUL AND HIS EPISTLES

### 1. CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF PAUL

*Plooij, D.*, De Chronologie van het Leven van Paulus. vii, 195 pp. Leiden, Brill, 1918. — *Weber, V.*, Die antiochenische Kollekte, die übersehene Hauptorientierung für die Paulusforschung. Grundlegende Radikalkur zur Geschichte des Urchristentums. xvi, 96 pp. Würzburg, Bauch, 1917.

*Plooij* (pastor at Leiden, conservative) has collected the archaeological and historical material completely and admirably. Particularly good is the treatment of the well known Gallio-inscription, which provides us with a relatively certain date for at least one important event in the life of Paul. In accordance with this, *Plooij* fixes Gallio's official year as May 51 to May 52, and assigns the meeting of Paul and Gallio to June or July 51. Further, relying upon an ingenious, though scarcely certain, hypothesis, he adopts the year 59 as the date of the change in office in the procuratorship of Palestine (Felix-Festus), which is so important for the chronology of Paul. He reaches this result from the statement in the Chronicon of Eusebius that Festus was appointed procurator in the tenth year of Agrippa II, but he reckons the years not from the death of Agrippa I, but from the appointment of Agrippa II as king in the year 50. But, like others, he does not relieve us from the difficulty that Pallas, whose intercession secured for Felix a not unfavorable welcome from Nero, had according to Tacitus been disgraced since 55.



Plooij follows the South Galatian theory, which he discusses in detail; he identifies the proceedings in Jerusalem described in Gal. 2 with the journey to bring the relief-fund of Acts 11; and puts Galatians itself before Acts 15 (in the year 48). See M. Jones, *Exp.* 1919; Windisch, *ThT*, 1919; F. W. Grosheide, *GerefThT*, 1918; A. Jülicher, *GGA* (to be published).

The chronology of the New Testament is a field for free investigation which has not yet been closed to Catholic scholars by the papal Biblical Commission. Ample use of this freedom is made by *V. Weber*, professor of theology at Würzburg, whose favorite theme is the chronological study of Galatians. Like Plooij he supports the South Galatian hypothesis and dates Galatians before the Apostolic Council (A.D. 49; Acts 15 being A.D. 50). In his latest work he devotes himself especially to the Antiochian relief-fund of Acts 11, 29 f., with which he identifies the efforts of Paul referred to in Gal. 2, 10b. While, however, Plooij directly identifies the relief-fund journey of Acts 11, 29 f. with that of Gal. 2, 1 ff.,<sup>1</sup> Weber thinks that the fund was not collected until after the meeting described in Gal. 2, 1 ff., and that the relief of the poor was a new point, being the method agreed on for ratifying the missionary compact then accepted.

I have expressed my objections to the exegesis of Plooij in *ThT*, 1919, pp. 171 f. It is, to be sure, remarkable that the two sentences related in meaning should have so similar a structure: Acts 11, 30 ὁ καὶ ἐποίησαν ἀποστέλλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρνάβα καὶ Σαύλου; Gal. 2, 10 ὁ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; and the question arises whether it is possible that Luke had in mind here the language of Galatians. Yet we must not allow ourselves to be misled by the likeness. The execution of the agreement of Gal. 2, 10b cannot, as Plooij assumes, have preceded the compact; the identification of the two journeys is impossible. Weber has seen this, yet his own view creates new difficulties. Ac-

<sup>1</sup> Under that view Gal. 2, 10 would mean: 'The men of Jerusalem asked us to keep on remembering the poor in the future, — the very purpose for which I had actually just come to Jerusalem.'

cording to him the relief journey of Acts 11, 29 f. was subsequent to the meeting of Gal. 2, 1-10. Why then did Luke completely fail to mention this motive for the collection, and make no reference at all to the extremely important meeting of the Apostles (Gal. 2, 1 ff.)? Weber's argument to show that Gal. 2 and Acts 15 are reports of two different events, is not convincing, although he makes clear the differences of the two accounts. If we hold to the identity of Gal. 2, 1-10 and Acts 15, then necessarily all relation between Acts 11, 29 f. and Gal. 2, 10 disappears, while on the other hand the trustworthiness of the whole story of a relief-fund journey undertaken by Paul, and not merely by Barnabas, becomes questionable.

## 2. CHRONOLOGY OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES

*Feine, P.*, Die Abfassung des Philipperbriefs in Ephesus, mit einer Anlage über Röm. 16, 3-20 als Epheserbrief (BFTh 20, 1916). 149 pp. — *Hadorn, W.*, Die Abfassung der Thessalonicherbriefe in der Zeit der dritten Missionsreise des Paulus (BFTh 24, 1919). 134 pp. — *Hadorn, W.*, Die Abfassung der Thessalonicherbriefe auf der dritten Missionsreise and der Kanon des Marcion (ZNW 19, 67-71).

As in the case of Galatians so with Philippians a new dating and position in the series has for some time been under discussion.<sup>1</sup> In Germany *P. Feine* (professor at Halle) has tried to establish elaborately the hypothesis proposed by Lisco, Deissmann, and Albertz that Philippians belongs to a period of imprisonment at Ephesus. (See also his *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 2. Aufl., 1918, pp. 142 ff.) His *first* argument is founded upon the vehement polemic of Paul in Phil. 3, which he believes to be directed not against Jews, but against Jewish Christian opponents, and which must therefore be assigned to the great period of controversy with pseudo-christian Judaism. This argument assumes that the conflict later ceased; Romans, with its calm and well-considered exposition of the gospel, being evidently written after a settlement had been reached. The sharp attack of Romans 16, 17-20 must also belong to an earlier period. Two objections suggest themselves to this view,

<sup>1</sup> See K. Lake and B. W. Bacon in *Expositor* (8th series), 8 and 9; Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the N. T.*, 3d ed., p. 622.

which in itself is not unacceptable. In the first place, it seems to me that a reference of the polemic in Philippians to non-Christian Jews is by no means impossible. Indeed this is rather the more natural way to take it; Paul merely contrasts Judaism and Christianity, *tertium non datur*. In κατὰ ξῆλον διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (3, 6) only Jews (and not Jewish Christians) could see a reason for confidence in the flesh. There is no suggestion of an incomplete conversion or of any lack of clearness as to the full bearing of Christian faith, no such utterance as we read in 2 Cor. 5, 16. Again, even if the passage were directed against Jewish Christians, it is possible that the conflict with the Judaizers lasted on or was rekindled. More significant seems to me a *second* argument urged by Feine; namely, the resemblance (long ago emphasized by Lightfoot) in style, contents, and theology between Philippians on the one hand and the epistles of the earlier period (Thess., Gal., 1 and 2 Cor., and Rom.) on the other, while the true 'epistles of the imprisonment,' Colossians and Ephesians, obviously present a sharp contrast to Philippians as well as to the earlier epistles, and in any case represent in their theology a later stage in the development of Pauline thought. A *third* argument is found by comparing the statements about the trial of Paul in Acts 23 ff. with the allusions in Phil. 1 f. The strict confinement which Philippians implies is not attested by Acts; and that Paul's situation grew worse after two years Feine does not think probable. *Fourthly*, Feine seeks to show that the two passages often taken to refer directly to Rome — the mention of the *praetorium* and the greeting from the imperial slaves — point to a provincial city like Ephesus rather than to the capital. *Finally*, he brings up the particular circumstances of the writing of Philippians, especially the points that according to 1, 17–30 the founding of the church did not lie in the distant past, and that there had been easy and active intercourse between Paul and the church. For these and other reasons Feine dates Philippians in the middle of Paul's long stay at Ephesus, A.D. 54.

In the 'Appendix' Feine presents a detailed argument for the widely held hypothesis that we have in Rom. 16, 3–20 an

epistle to the Ephesians, with special reference to the counter-arguments of Lightfoot. There are, as he explains in an interesting investigation, no conclusive reasons for believing that the persons named in the greetings were in Rome, and Rufus is not the Christian mentioned in Mark 15, 21, and often supposed to be living in Rome. The only novelty in his treatment is his mode of explaining why an epistle to the Ephesians came to be appended to the Epistle to the Romans. Phoebe, the bearer of the Epistle to the Romans, had to go by way of Ephesus on business; consequently Paul added to his Epistle to the Romans (which he wished to have read to the Ephesians) greetings to his Ephesian friends.

The problem of Philippians is an old story, but the monograph of *Hadorn* (professor at Bern) undertakes to overthrow a view which seemed absolutely firm and which no one seriously questioned. The current opinion is that the two epistles to the Thessalonians were written at Corinth only a few months after the formation of the church in Thessalonica. Hadorn believes that this time is too short to cover the events and developments implied in these epistles, and for this and other reasons he proposes to transfer both epistles to the period of the so-called 'third missionary journey,' or rather to the long stay at Ephesus.

Hadorn's line of argument closely resembles that of Feine in the very important proof which he presents that the Thessalonian epistles give evidence of close internal kinship to 1 and 2 Corinthians. The defence of himself which the Apostle finds it necessary to make in 1 Thess. 2 and 3 resembles in contents and style the apologetic and polemic passages in 2 Cor., and finds its explanation in them. This accords with the fact that the religious movement which Paul opposes in 1 Thessalonians is in many respects similar to tendencies attested for Corinth in 1 and 2 Corinthians. In this connection Hadorn adduces the doubts as to the resurrection, the libertinistic tendencies, the advice about spiritual gifts, the disturbances of order, etc. In his view we might almost regard 1 Thessalonians as a kind of extract from the epistles to the Corinthians. On this similarity rests his main argu-



ment, outlined above. Since the tendency did not crystallize in Corinth for a long time after Paul's first departure from that church, a few months is not enough to account for similar events in Thessalonica. Other circumstances, too, such as the rapidity of the 'spiritual' development in the Thessalonian church, the spread of the fame of that church throughout the world (1 Thess. 1, 7), the existence of a definite, ordered church government, the cases of death, etc., weigh against accepting so short an interval. To be sure, the familiar statements in 1 Thess. 3, 1 ff. require that Paul should have been in Greece in the interval since the growth of the objectionable Thessalonian tendencies. Since this passage does not tally verbally with Acts, Hadorn is able to connect it with the so-called intermediate visit to Corinth, and supposes that Paul's purpose to visit Thessalonica was frustrated by the disturbances at Corinth.

The case of 2 Thessalonians is similar; but Hadorn, like some before him, thinks that it preceded 1 Thessalonians. Using for this inversion the same arguments as J. Weiss (*Urchristentum*, pp. 217 ff.), he puts particular emphasis on the observation that the second epistle nowhere refers to the first, but rather has the appearance of a first epistle to the church. In itself considered, 2 Thessalonians could well have come from the first stay in Corinth; for Hadorn recognizes in ὁ κατέχων the Emperor Claudius, and so gains the year 54 as *terminus ad quem* for the epistle. But since the general situation of the second epistle is like that of the first, the second also must be assigned to the Ephesian period, although to an earlier stage of it.

It is easier to pass judgment on this suggestive hypothesis than on the new date for Philippians. Much in it is attractive, especially the proof that 1 Thessalonians reflects a situation similar to that of the Corinthian epistles, and the explanation that it would have been a miracle if painful disturbances, such as took years to develop in Corinth, had arisen in Thessalonica in a few weeks or months. Nevertheless, so late a date is impossible, being forbidden by the fact that in 1 Thessalonians the impressions of the first contact are still so fresh, much

fresher than in 1 Corinthians or Philippians. Moreover, the stay of Paul in Beroea and Athens, and afterwards the residence of eighteen months in Corinth, cover more than "some few months." If the Thessalonian epistles are dated toward the end of the Corinthian period, and not near its beginning, we have more than a year for the development of the situation. And if, with Hadorn, we date the epistles later, in the beginning of the Ephesian period, we meet the objection that it is wholly improbable that Paul should have sent no letter to the Thessalonians during his eighteen months in Corinth.

That the order of the two Thessalonian epistles ought to be reversed has not been proved.<sup>1</sup>

### 3. GENUINENESS OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES

*Weinel, H.*, Die Echtheit der Paulinischen Hauptbriefe im Lichte des antignostischen Kampfes (Festgabe für J. Kaftan, 376-393). Tübingen, Mohr, 1920. — *Wrzot, Josef*, Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefes (BSt 19). 152 pp. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1916. — *Brückner, W.*, Die Zeitlage der Briefe an die Kolosser und Epheser (PrM, 1918, 68-83, 130-138, 163-181). — *Torm, F.*, Über die Sprache in den Pastoralbriefen (ZNW 18, 1918, 225-243).

*Weinel's* new argument for the genuineness of the chief Pauline epistles deals with an important point, for he brings the question into the light of the great antignostic struggle. The Pauline epistles show that gnostic tendencies already existed; but the way in which Paul opposes the 'gnostic' positions (things offered to idols, sexual life, etc.), while at the same time representing certain gnostic ideas himself, shows plainly that the great struggle had not yet begun. This is an important point of view for the date of the epistles.

The book of *Josef Wrzot* (Catholic *Religionslehrer* in Austrian Silesia) has as its object to dissipate the last suspicion

<sup>1</sup> In the supplementary article in ZNW Hadorn appeals to the order of the epistles in the canon of Marcion: Gal., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Rom., 1 Thess., 2 Thess., Eph., Col. Philem., Phil. This argument of course proves nothing if the internal reasons are not convincing. Jülicher (ThLZ, 1919, No. 21-22) and von Dobschütz (LZBl, 1920, No. 1) reject the argument, as well as F. W. Grosheide, 'De Methode om de volgorde der Paulinische Brieven te bepalen, in het bijzonder in verband met de Brieven aan de Thessalonicensen onderzocht' (GerefThT, 30, 262-270, 305-319); on the other hand de Zwaan (NThSt, 1919, p. 259) seems on the whole to agree with it.

of the genuineness of 2 Thessalonians. It is written with the thoroughness and prolixity customary in such works. In a history of the problem the most important arguments against genuineness are presented *in extenso*: (1) the contradiction in the eschatology (2 Thess. 2 in contrast with 1 Thess. 4-5); (2) the literary dependence of 2 Thess. upon 1 Thess. and its un-pauline language — Wrede's main argument; (3) the references which betray a forger in 2 Thess. 2, 2 and 3, 17; (4) the impersonal character of 2 Thessalonians, especially as emphasized by Spitta. These arguments the author tries to meet by setting forth the historical and psychological background implied in the epistles. In 2 Thess. 2, 2 [cf. (3) above] it has been deemed strange that Paul treats so slightly the report of the circulation in Thessalonica of a false letter bearing his name, — but Wrzōł explains this on the ground that Paul lacked sure information and wavered as to whether 1 Thess. had been misunderstood, or an epistle actually forged. Assuming the second possibility, he wrote in a tone of criticism 3, 17. To explain the close kinship between 1 Thess. and 2 Thess. [cf. (2) above] Wrzōł follows the theory of Zahn. He supposes that the epistles of Paul were dictated, and that from the first draft a fair copy was made, an hypothesis which is certainly admissible for 1 Thess. Now there was a reason which might have led Paul to study the draft of 1 Thess. in the composition of 2 Thess., namely the suspicions mentioned in 2 Thess. 2, 2, which made it desirable both to confirm and supplement the assurances and admonitions given in 1 Thess. Even if Wrzōł exaggerates in details, yet his leading idea seems to be correct. The contradiction in the tendency of the eschatological warnings in 1 Thess. [cf. (1) above] Wrzōł seeks to obviate by the remark, first, that according to 1 Thess. 5, 1 ff. only the heathen are destined to be surprised, not the Christians, who have been informed about times and tokens, and, secondly, that the same difference is also found in the eschatological discourses of Jesus. This reply is scarcely satisfactory. In 1 Thess. 5 there is surely no thought whatever of the contents of 2 Thess. 2; a writer who has in mind the apocalyptic ideas of that chapter cannot possibly shape his exhortation as it stands

in 1 Thess. 5. As for the Synoptic Gospels, these are the product of literary compilation, and that all the elements come from Jesus is not certain. The psychological difficulty here is, however, hardly serious enough to make us doubt the genuineness of 2 Thess. What Wrzoł says about the supposed impersonal character of the second epistle [cf. (4) above] has my approval. But the whole essay seems to have been written without reference to the more recent discussions.

A problem akin to that just discussed is presented by the peculiar relation between Ephesians and Colossians. K. Lake (Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity, pp. 122 f.), referring to the difficulty of the question, has recently shown his sympathy with Holtzmann's solution, and in any case opposed the popular view that Colossians is genuine, Ephesians not genuine. Meanwhile *W. Brückner* (Karlsruhe) has published in a series of articles a study moving in part on the line laid down by Holtzmann. He gives an historical survey of the development of the problem, here taking ground in opposition to Dibelius, who represents the 'popular' opinion, and to Soltau (ThStKr, 1905, 521-562), who has made still more complicated Holtzmann's analysis by drawing into the discussion the Epistle to the Laodiceans. Brückner dwells especially on the doctrinal contents, and on the literary dependence of Ephesians on 1 Peter. The ideas of both Colossians and Ephesians are, according to Brückner, post-pauline, gnostic. The terminology is dependent on the language of the mysteries. In addition a form of logos-speculation appears which stands in an intermediate position between that of Hebrews and of John, while the epistles differ from both these writings in their neglect of the humanity and historical character of Jesus. (This last observation is much to the point.) The greater simplicity of thought in 1 Peter (which Brückner places in the period of Trajan) proves the priority of the latter. Unfortunately Brückner has failed to discuss in detail the literary relation between Colossians and Ephesians. He merely distinguishes three strata; (1) the original Colossians of Paul (ethical exhortation, warnings against false doctrine, epistolary sections); (2) the introduction of a cosmic christology into



Colossians; (3) the composition of Ephesians on the basis of Colossians, the passages being added which touch on the doctrine of the church. Col. 1, 18 and 2, 19 are interpolations.

The difficulty, indeed, of all investigations in the history of language and style is shown by the work of *F. Torm* (professor at Copenhagen). It is in the main a discussion of Holtzmann's criticism of the Pastoral Epistles. Torm shows how questionable many of Holtzmann's critical judgments are. If the use of language is to be a factor in criticism, it is not sufficient to make lists of *hapax legomena*, and to show that specifically Pauline words are lacking; we must also examine the individual cases, seek the natural reasons for the phenomena, attend to corresponding conditions in the other epistles, and, especially, must group the phenomena in accordance with the groups of epistles. Thus Torm succeeds in proving that a whole series of Holtzmann's arguments are not convincing. It is interesting that he is able to point out some fairly close connections between the Pastorals and Group III (Eph., Phil., Col.). But many arguments of importance have not been touched upon by Torm, and consequently have not lost their force.

#### 4. INTEGRITY OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES

*Schanze, W.*, Der Galaterbrief (Das Neue Testament schallanalytisch untersucht. 1. Stück). 1. Aufl. iv, 36 pp.; 2. Aufl. xvi, 12 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1918, 1919. — *Jülicher, A.*, Eine Epoche in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft? (PrM 24, 1920, 41–56). — *Lietzmann H.*, (GGA, 1919, 223–229, 401–419).

Literary criticism of the N. T. would have to be placed on an entirely new footing if we could use with certainty for the discovery of the literary relations of ancient texts the method of sound-analysis, which has been elaborated by Eduard Sievers, the well-known Germanist at Leipzig, in collaboration with the student of phonetics, J. Rutz, and which has been employed with much success in the field of Middle High German literature. By sound-analysis is meant the method of discovering definite types of rhythm and melody, to produce which psychological and physiological factors (posture, move-

ment of the arms) combine.<sup>1</sup> Sievers and his pupils believe that they can discover the individual rhythm of an author, and thereby distinguish foreign elements as editorial or interpolative. Every student of the criticism of the Pauline epistles understands that it would be extremely important if the investigation of their unity and genuineness could be conducted by more exact technical methods, but the study which *Schanze*, a pupil of Sievers, offers as a first essay removes for the moment any expectation here. The result is completely useless for anyone who, though a layman in sound-analysis, is a professional in the literary and theological investigation of the epistles. Without regard to meaning or connection, the method of sound-analysis applied to Galatians simply mangles the epistle. A Pauline foundation is indeed admitted; but between the Pauline sections a second leading voice intrudes, without rhyme or reason, to which especially the proof from Scripture in chap. 3 is to be attributed; in addition smaller passages are contributed by others (to whom belong such characteristic fragments as 1, 10-12, 22-24; 4, 24-29; 3, 1-4); and there are interpolators. As the voice-analyst explains, the non-pauline elements distinguish themselves, in contrast to the peculiar fresh and vigorous rhythm of Paul, by a cool, sensible, and didactic tone. So the dialectic passages in particular are denied to Paul, — an opinion in which no one who is not a sound-analyst will concur. The new method might command more attention if it enabled us to determine with some inner verisimilitude the possible share of an 'epistolary partner.' But, according to *Schanze*, even in the larger passages we have to do with a later wholesale interpolator.

In a detailed investigation *Jülicher* has criticized *Schanze's* analysis. He rightly emphasizes that Paul's nature was far richer and more complicated than would appear on the basis of the fragments which *Schanze* ascribes to him; that Paul often operates with borrowed material (quotations from the LXX, liturgical and hortatory formulas, etc.); and that the genesis of Galatians, as *Schanze* puts it before us, is hard to imagine. *Lietzmann's* experiment is instructive; with a text arbitrarily

<sup>1</sup> Eduard Sievers, *Metrische Studien* IV, Leipzig, 1918.

compounded from six or seven sources, sound-analysis failed to analyze it correctly, though it was able to indicate some of the interpolations.<sup>1</sup>

#### 5. COMMENTARIES ON THE PAULINE EPISTLES

*Lietzmann, H.*, Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe. An die Römer (Handbuch zum N. T.). 2. Aufl. 129 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1919. — *Barth, K.*, Der Römerbrief. 440 pp. Bern, Bäschlin, 1919. — *Koch, L. J.*, Fortolkning til Paulus' andet brev til Korinthierne. 451 pp. Copenhagen, Frimodt, 1914-1917.

*Lietzmann's* Romans is the first of the commentaries of the *Handbuch* to appear in a second edition. Wholly new is his excellent introduction to the textual problems of the epistles. From the origin of the collection of Pauline epistles, for understanding which the analogy of the collection of the epistles of Ignatius is brought into service, Lietzmann proceeds to survey the three groups of texts: Egyptian (B<sup>NA</sup>C a78 sah boh, etc.), Western (DG Ambrst Pelag vulg, etc.), and Byzantine (KLP min pesh goth, etc.). Any use of the text of Pamphilus-Eusebius must await a fuller determination of that text than has yet been made. In the Western text Lietzmann suspects the influence of Marcion. For the discovery of the best text it is necessary to eliminate the secondary Byzantine and Western variants and take the Egyptian text as the foundation. The commentary treats the more important variants. In the exegesis everything of consequence published since 1906 has been used. In Rom. 7, 24 Lietzmann has now abandoned the change of order and the omission which he formerly defended. The excursus on 'Flesh and Spirit' has been enlarged in view of Reitzenstein's investigations; likewise that on 'Jesus the Lord' (10, 9) in dependence on Bousset. An excursus on *οἱ ἅγιοι* (15, 25) is new. As for the textual history of the last two chapters, the excision of chapters 15 and 16 was due to Marcion, the doxology (16, 25-27) is perhaps from Marcionite circles.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also E. Sievers, H. Lietzmann und die Schallanalyse. Eine Kritik und eine Selbstkritik (Das Neue Testament schallanalytisch untersucht. 2. Stuck). 48 pp. 1919. — For a very good review see G. Kittel, Die Schallanalyse und das Neue Testament (ThLBl, 1922, 1). — H. Lietzmann is preparing a reply.

<sup>2</sup> On this latter hypothesis see Harnack, 'Über 1. Kor. 14, 32 ff. und Röm. 16, 25 ff. nach der ältesten Überlieferung und der Marcionitischen Bibel' (SAB, 1919, 527-

The elaborate exposition of Romans by the Swiss pastor, *Karl Barth*, is of different calibre from Lietzmann's commentary, with the latter's constant use of philology and the history of religions. 'Historical' exegesis is here taken for granted, yet the book is essentially a representative of the new religious enthusiasm which is endeavoring to emerge from the intellectual, political, and social confusion of Central Europe, and to create a new foundation for the life of the spirit on a religious and Christian basis. Barth belongs to the younger generation, which is translating the old Pauline gospel into our language, and by means of genuine Pauline Christianity, thus modernized, seeks to overthrow and destroy everything actually or supposedly irreconcilable with it, — religious individualism, theology based on experience, intellectualism, imperialism in every form, ecclesiasticism, socialism, bolshevism. The shattering of all false human ideals, the outbreak of a creative revolution, wrought by God, which shall bring to birth a new human race and introduce a new era in human history, — this is the great ideal, the powerful reality, which has possessed the author and which in all its concrete applications he finds in Paul. The book excited much attention in Switzerland and Germany, and has evoked thoughtful discussion. See especially Jülicher, *ChrW*, 1920, Nos. 29 and 30.<sup>1</sup>

The Danish scholar, *Koch*, defends the unity of 2 Corinthians, except that 6, 14-7,1 may belong to the epistle which preceded 1 Corinthians. He accepts the hypothesis of a letter, but rejects that of a visit, in the interval between 1 and 2 Corinthians, but holds that a second visit of Paul to Corinth took place shortly before the composition of 1 Corinthians. The value of the commentary lies in its detailed exegesis, and especially in the lexicographical material.

536), where the words *καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν*, and *γνωρισθέντος* are removed as glosses, and the original form of the doxology then attributed to Marcionites. The doxology certainly could have been written by a Marcionite, but equally well by a non-marcionite follower of Paul (cf. Eph. 3, 9 f.), or even (to judge by 1 Cor. 2, 8) by Paul himself.

<sup>1</sup> A second edition, with a remarkable preface, "in neuer Bearbeitung" has appeared in 1922 (xvii, 523 pp., Munich, Kaiser). Since 1921 Barth has been professor of Calvinistic (Reformed) Theology at Göttingen.



## 6. RISE OF THE PAULINE CANON

*Hartke, W.*, Die Sammlung und die ältesten Ausgaben der Paulusbriefe. 87 pp. Bonn, Georgi, 1917.

The work of *W. Hartke* at least draws attention to the problem it treats. On various grounds it may be assumed that small collections of Pauline epistles were early in existence, certainly soon after the death of Paul. The need of having the apostolic word in written form must have been felt at once, and somewhere and at some time a collection must have been made which served as a model for others. Since our collection includes no letters to Antioch or other Syrian churches (although Paul must have written to them), it may be concluded that the standard edition came into existence in Greece, Asia Minor, or Rome; the most probable supposition seems to be Asia Minor. Beyond these unobjectionable conclusions it seems hazardous to try to work out the history in further detail. *Hartke* offers a great mass of fantastic speculation about one collection made by Timothy and used by Marcion, and another due to Silas.<sup>1</sup>

## 7. PAULINE THEOLOGY

## A

*Weinel, H.*, Paulus. Der Mensch und sein Werk: Die Anfänge des Christentums, der Kirche, und des Dogmas (Lebensfragen). 2. Aufl. 294 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1915. — *Heitmüller, W.*, Die Bekehrung des Paulus (ZThK 27, 1917, 136–153). — *Oepke, A.*, Die Missionspredigt des Apostels Paulus. Eine biblisch-theologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen 2). 240 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1920. — *Stange, E.*, Paulinische Reisepläne (BFTh 22). 78 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1918. — *Mundle, W.*, Die Eigenart der paulinischen Frömmigkeit. 19 pp. Marburg, Elwert, 1920. — *Weiss, J.*, Die Bedeutung des Paulus für den modernen Christen (ZNW 19, 127–142). — *Deissner, K.*, Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit. 1. Aufl. 123 pp.; 2. Aufl. 148 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1918, 1921. — *Deissner, K.*, Paulus und Seneca (BFTh 21). 44 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1917. — *Weber, E.*, Die Formel "in Christo Jesu" und die paulinische Christumystik (NkZ 31, 213–260). — *Ubbink, J. Th.*, Het eeuwige leven bij Paulus. Een godsdiensthistorisch onderzoek. viii, 174, lxx pp. Groningen, Wolters, 1917. — *Schmidt, Tr.*, Der Leib

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *E. Stange*, 'Diktierpausen in den paulinischen Briefen' (ZNW 18, 1818, 109–117).

Christi (Σῶμα Χριστοῦ). Eine Untersuchung zum urchristlichen Gemeindegedanken. 256 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1919. — *Scharling, C. J.*, Ekklesiabegrebet hos Paulus og dets forhold til jødisk religion og hellenistisk mystik. 212 pp. Copenhagen, P. Branner Norregade, 1917. — *Philippi, F.*, Paulus und das Judentum nach den Briefen und der Apostelgeschichte. 68 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1916. — *Macholz*, Zum Verständnis des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsgedankens (ThStKr, 1915, 29–61). — *Kurze, G.*, Der Engels- und Teufelsglaube des Apostels Paulus. 168 pp. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1915. — *Juncker, A.*, Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus. II. Hälfte: Die konkrete Ethik. viii, 308 pp. Halle, Niemeyer, 1919.

## B

*Steck, R.*, Geistliche Ehen bei Paulus (1 Kor. 7, 36–38) (SchwThZ 34, 177–189). — *Jülicher, A.*, Die Jungfrauen im ersten Korintherbrief (PrM 22, 97–119). — *Reitzenstein, R.*, Die Formel "Glaube, Liebe, Hoffnung" bei Paulus (NGW, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1916, 367–416). — *Reitzenstein, R.*, Die Entstehung der Formel "Glaube, Liebe, Hoffnung" (HZ, 1916, 189–208). — *Reitzenstein, R.*, Nachwort (NGW, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1917, 130–151). — *Harnack, A. von*, Über den Ursprung der Formel "Glaube, Liebe, Hoffnung" (PrJ 164, 1916, 1–14); also in *Aus der Friedens- und Kriegsarbeit*, 1–20, Giessen, Töpelmann, 1916. — *Corssen, P.*, Paulus und Porphyrios I (Sokrates 73, 18–30). — *Corssen, P.*, Paulus und Porphyrios II (Zur Erklärung von 2 Kor. 3, 18) (ZNW 19, 2–10). — *Lütgert, W.*, Gesetz und Geist. Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefes (BFTh 22). 106 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1919. — *Jäger, W. W.*, Eine stilgeschichtliche Studie zum Philipperbrief (Hermes 50, 537–553). — *Jülicher, A.*, Ein philologisches Gutachten über Phil. 2, v. 6 (ZNW 17, 1916, 1–17). — *Schmidt, P. W.*, "Hielt es nicht für einen Raub, Gott gleich sein" (PrM, 1916, 171–176). — *Kittel, G.*, Rabbinnica. Paulus im Talmud. Die "Macht" auf dem Haupte. Runde Zahlen (Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentums 1). 47 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1920.

## A

No new comprehensive work on the theology and religion of Paul has appeared. In the new edition of *Weinel's* Paulus the general purpose has remained the same, to make Paul intelligible to the modern reader as devout man and as theologian, and to remove misunderstandings and prejudices. Weinell tries to translate the ideas of Paul into the language of the present day and to bring out strongly the religious and human motives. A few new paragraphs have been added and the arrangement somewhat altered.

*Heitmüller* has written an important and thoughtful study of the conversion of Paul, with trenchant criticism of current

views. He insists that the moral conflict within the mind of the unredeemed man (Romans, chapter 7) is not to be used for an understanding of the spiritual condition of Paul before his conversion. The  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$  is not to be taken as personal and individual; and the point of view from which the chapter is written is that of the Christian, who has already received purification and who draws the picture in the light of his own experience.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly Heitmüller entirely rejects the idea of a moral collapse and the overthrow of legalistic moralism in connection with Paul's conversion. All that came in question was the messiahship of Jesus and the legitimacy of the mission to gentiles, that is, the abrogation of Jewish prerogative. The conversion was an ecstatic mystical experience in which the appearance of Christ was the centre, the annulment of the claims of the Law a secondary consequence. Heitmüller regards the doctrine of justification as a product of the later development of Paul as Christian and missionary. See E. Vischer, ThR, 1917, 371 ff.

A. Oepke has made a fairly successful attempt to elicit the actual missionary preaching of Paul from the epistles, with the aid of the narratives of Acts, and to discover its relations to the syncretistic environment of Jewish and heathen thought and life. On the whole he thinks that Paul adapted himself but little to his heathen environment, and that his knowledge of heathenism did not go beyond what he could hear and see in ordinary intercourse. The main elements of the missionary preaching (as distinguished from instruction of the baptized) he finds to have been the message of redemption through Jesus Christ, his incarnation, death, and resurrection, and the eschatological expectation, together with (as propaedeutic) faith in one God and the awakening of a consciousness of sin. Far from supposing that this preaching may have attached itself to heathen popular religion, a doctrine of mysteries, or philosophy, Oepke lays stress on the novelty and originality of the Christian gospel, and on the contrast, not the analogy, which it presented to these things. The gospel of the Son of God who

<sup>1</sup> On the problem of Romans 7 see the dissertation of H. S. Pretorius, *Bijdrage tot de exegeze en de geschiedenis der exegeze van Romeinen vii* (Amsterdam, 1915).

lived a true human life finds there no analogy. Doubtless the hearers were reminded of all sorts of heathen religious ideas,—means of expiation, hope of salvation, notions of the future; but the new message had its own peculiar character, and offered absolute certainty.

In the Pauline speeches of Acts Oepke sees the same general scheme. Only in the speech on Mars' Hill, which he treats in detail and the originality of which he defends against Norden, does the hellenistic stamp seem to him somewhat stronger, so that in this case some embellishment by Luke must be supposed. In the criticism of the inscription ('to the unknown god') he follows Birt (RhM, N.F. 69, 342 ff.); the inscription read  $\theta\epsilon\omega$  (without  $\alpha\gamma\nu\acute{o}\sigma\tau\omega$ ), but Paul had not seen it himself. Oepke's work is conceived as a foundation for a constructive history of Pauline theology in which attention is to be fixed upon its motive forces and inner structure.<sup>1</sup>

According to *E. Stange* Paul's plans of travel were of two kinds, rational and irrational. Far-reaching strategic missionary plans played no great part, for Stange denies that Paul was concerned to work at the great centres. His plans were sometimes affected by the existence of Jewish colonies and synagogues, whether as points of attachment or as fostering attacks and intrigues. In his apostolic mission the extension of the gospel to cities hitherto untouched was of more importance than the care of the churches, the effect of which on the course of Paul's movements and on his periods of residence Stange unduly minimizes. Irrational motives appear in intimations of the will of God, actions of Satan, and revelations of the Lord, the last being especially mentioned in Acts. On the whole, irrational motives were rare, and were usually accompanied by rational purpose. Stange's running comparison with the motives which guided the travels of Apollonius of Tyana and with those mentioned in the apocryphal acts of the Apostles is highly instructive.

*W. Mundle* (privat-dozent at Marburg) finds the chief peculiarity of Paul's piety in the tensions and contradictions

<sup>1</sup> See also K. Pieper, *Die Missionspredigt des Paulus. Ihre Fundstellen und ihr Inhalt* (Predigtstudien 4). 126 pp., Paderborn, Schöningh, 1921.



which it manifests. His conversion relieved a certain tension, but engendered new inner conflicts which he never succeeded in wholly resolving, for example, regarding the Law, and in his attitude to Sin (now the consciousness of a 'spiritual' man free from sin, now that of the imperfect and agonizing soul). Deissner, on the other hand (ThGg, 1920, pp. 188 f.) sees the individuality and power of Paul's self-consciousness in the union of apparently contradictory feelings.

The significance for the modern church of this Pauline piety, which makes in many ways so strange an impression upon us, is discussed by *J. Weiss* in a rather slight posthumous article. The great and abiding significance resides in Paul's faith in God (creation, providence, election, loving will), in the religious kernel of the doctrine of justification, in the mystical union with Christ (in which, however, many elements which were essential for Paul have to be abandoned), and in the ethics (the law of love).

The tendency to give great scope to the hellenistic gnostic influences in Paul meets active opposition from the conservative side in Germany and Holland. *K. Deissner* treats chiefly the views of Reitzenstein and Bousset, and is mainly occupied with the doctrine ascribed to Paul of the double self (Paul under the control of the Spirit a different man). He tries to state as accurately as possible the differences between the Pauline gnosis and that of the Hermetic literature; the former having relation to ethics and the scheme of salvation, the latter being mystical and enthusiastic, operating with a natural force unrelated to the inner conflict of spirit and flesh. Hence Deissner understands by the Pauline *τέλειος* the Christian who is ready to be guided by the Spirit; and denies that by *τέλειοι* is intended a kind of élite, a body of supermen, or that Paul preached two gospels, one for the mature, one for the immature. The hellenistic type of gnosis is seen among the Corinthians in their enthusiasm, lack of moral seriousness, confidence in their own power, insistence on self-determination, and arrogance. This is important, but the contrast to this mysticism which Paul exhibits is not so complete that we can deny to Paul himself all relation to mysticism. Further, Deissner holds

that Paul did not, like the mystics, conceive the new self as wholly separate from the old (cf. 2 Cor. 12, 1 ff., and Gal. 2, 20, discussed by Reitzenstein); but his criticism is here exaggerated. He is partly right and partly wrong in describing the Pauline piety as not ecstatic, and Paul's mysticism as personal, not sacramental. To the second edition a descriptive sketch of Paul's piety has been added in which the mystical element is again minimized. See E. Posselt, *BphW*, 1918, No. 37-38, 1921, No. 19.

*Deissner's* study of Paul and Seneca does not cover the ground, the ideas compared being limited to the idea of eternity, the doctrine of God, the doctrine of man, and ethics. His account of the Pauline ideas in question is inadequate, and many of the analogies he has not touched. He properly calls attention to fundamental differences which should put us on our guard against hastily inferring that Paul derived his ideas from Seneca's philosophy. See J. Leipoldt, *ThLBl*, 1918, No. 5; Posselt, *BphW*, 1917, 1262 ff.; Ubbink, *NThSt*, 1918, 275-282; C. Clemen, *DLZ*, 1921, No. 32-33. On the theme, 'Paul and Seneca,' see also J. de Zwaan, 'Een broeder van Seneca tegenover Paulus' (*Stemmen des Tijds* 8, 43-74).

The merit of *E. Weber's* article resides in his contention that the formula 'in Christ Jesus' relates not only to the spiritual Christ, but also to the exalted Lord, who rules over us, and to the Mediator of Salvation, who brought salvation by his historical appearance on earth. Furthermore, the mystical relation is established by faith; and this circumstance lends to Paul's mysticism a unique character which distinguishes it from heathen mysticism, tending, as that does, to dissolve the relationships of personality. The hellenistic analogies do not lose their value through these considerations; but we see that Pauline mysticism, while it uses hellenistic formulas, is not identical with that form of mysticism, but is an intimate mingling of union with the spiritual Christ, obedient service of the Lord, and a mysticism founded in history.

With a method similar to that of *Deissner* *J. Th. Ubbink*, in his very learned doctor's dissertation on eternal life in Paul, takes up chiefly the theses of Reitzenstein and Bousset con-

cerning the influence on Paul of the mystery-religions and of mysticism. By the aid of grave-stones, the philosophical literature, and the documents of the mysteries, he sets forth the ideas about the other world and the future destinies of souls which prevailed in Paul's hellenistic environment. This section with the accompanying notes is very full, and does not lack value for those who reject the author's main position. That is presented in the third chapter, where a comparison of Pauline and hellenistic views leads to the conclusion that Paul is essentially independent. In this comparison the differences are continually exaggerated; and it is not convincingly shown that Old Testament doctrine suffices to explain the Pauline anthropology, which his eschatology assumes. Ubbink can see only contrasts to Paul in the religious ideas of the hellenistic world. Besides assembling an abundance of material he gives a great number of literary references. See ThLZ, 1918, No. 12-13. Of similar tendency is the inaugural lecture of Brouwer (professor at Utrecht), *Paulus Mysticus?* 1921. The answer is in the negative. J. P. Bang, 'Var Paulus "Mystiker"'? (TT 4, 45-128) I have not seen.

A freer attitude toward the problems of the history of religions was that of *Tr. Schmidt* (who fell in the war, 1918), as his excellent book shows. He gives an admirable exposition of the Pauline mysticism, and its assumptions, namely, the ideas of the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, the conception of Christ as exerting a continued activity (in the Spirit and in the sacraments), the relation between Christ and the Spirit, and between the exalted Christ and the historical Jesus. To whatever criticism details of this study may be exposed, it offers as a whole an illuminating account of the relations which bind together the mystical expressions of Paul. From the mystical relation between Christ and the individual Schmidt turns to that between Christ and the ecclesia. The church is the body of Christ infused with life by the Spirit, and by virtue of its relation to the spiritual Christ it acquires a kind of collective personality, with Christ as its head. From the point of view of the general history of religions significant parallels are drawn, both from Judaism — such as the relations between Messiah and people, Christ and Adam,

Christ and the Son of Man, — and on the hellenistic side from the idea of *anthropos*. Schmidt rejects the notion of direct borrowing from Hellenism, but holds to an organic kinship between the Pauline idea of Christ and the hellenistic 'primitive man.' With Reitzenstein's recent inquiries into the Iranian origin of this figure he had no opportunity to become acquainted.

The use of the idea of the church as a 'collective individual,' and a factor in salvation, mediating between Christ the redeemer and the redeemed individual, is carried still farther by *C. J. Scharling*, who conceives of the church as actually the primary object of redemption, and so as the primary recipient of the Spirit, which has been poured out since the dawn of the new aeon. This church is even supposed to have been identified by Paul with Christ; through this mystical unity the church died and rose again with Christ, and forms the new humanity, so that individuals share in redemption only as members of the church. In support of this general view Scharling refers to Jewish and hellenistic elements, especially the idea of mystic unity between Israel and the shekinah or the torah, and hellenistic mysticism with its dualistic assumptions and enthusiastic, religious aims, — the difference being that Paul has incorporated his mystical elements into a fundamentally eschatological way of thinking, and united them with the collective idea of the church. The ecclesiastical setting of Paul's doctrines is due to his having received his mystical experiences in connection with the act of worship. These ideas deserve attention but require verification. It can at least be affirmed as certain that Paul in referring to redemption does not habitually insert the collective idea between Christ and the individual.

The posthumous essay of *F. Philippi* is a sketch by an able young theologian who lost his life in the war. He reaches the conclusion that in the epistles Paul appears as the inexorable opponent of the Jewish religion but the friend of the Jewish people, while in the Acts we see him portrayed as hostile to the people but as revering the Jewish religion. Luke must therefore have distorted his portrait of the apostle. See *E. Vischer*, *ThR*, 1917, 369 ff.



*Macholz's* penetrating study of justification by faith deals especially with the views of Wrede, and the latter's assertion, in company with others, of the secondary character of this doctrine. Paul's religious temperament required a principle which should be exclusively theocentric. After his conversion he was done with Judaism, and his doctrine of justification was the fruit of his earliest Christian experience. It includes, in Macholz's view, the whole of his experience of salvation, comprising both the benefits of an expiatory satisfaction and the believer's elevation into the sphere of the risen Lord's life. Macholz is not Pauline but Lutheran when he declares that the justified are to be regarded as already righteous, even though they have yet to become so. To that reflection Paul did not attain; his view is rather that purification of character is effected not in justification but in regeneration.

*G. Kurze* discusses from a Catholic point of view Dibelius's *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (1909). He cannot admit "disparate" elements in Paul; and will not permit later Jewish sources to be treated as documents of an environment from which Paul drew. The value of the book resides in the abundant references to other literature and in the convenient collection of the various explanations and arguments.

The first volume of *A. Juncker's Ethik* (1904, now in many ways antiquated) described the principles of the new moral life which springs up in Christians. In neither that volume nor the present one has the author profited much from modern study of Paul. Juncker discusses certain modern views, such as the derivation of the catalogue of vices from hellenistic or Jewish models, the assertion that Paul's ethical system has a world-renouncing character, etc. He denies that in 1 Cor. 7 the institution of *virgines subintroductae* is referred to, and gives substantial arguments for his view. In general, Jewish and hellenistic material is but sparingly introduced for comparison, and the book has little breadth of grasp. See M. Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1921, No. 13-14.

## B

The question of spiritual marriages in 1 Cor. 7, 36 ff. (or 25 ff.) has been taken up by Steck and Jülicher. *Steck* holds

that the passage refers to these marriages, but (like J. Weiss) takes the whole section, from vs. 25 on, to refer to the same topic (*παρθένοι* meaning couples of spiritually betrothed persons). From this exegesis he draws the inference that this section (like the rest of 1 Corinthians) belongs to the second century.

*Jülicher* denies that the betrothal idea extends to vss. 25 ff.; the reference to *συνείσακτοι* seems to him possible, but not proved. He is more inclined to think of a betrothed couple who, under the impression of Paul's preaching, had given up their determination to marry.

The idea, now accepted by Deissner, that a group at Corinth was strongly impregnated with hellenistic notions, would receive a startling illustration if a hypothesis put forward by *Reitzenstein* should ultimately stand. He first presented in his book *Historia monachorum et Historia Lausiaca*, then, in the articles named above, developed at greater length and defended against Harnack, the theory that the way in which Paul emphasizes in 1 Cor. 13, 13 the statement that faith, hope, and love abide, implies a controversy. Certain Corinthians had maintained against Paul a four-fold formula, 'knowledge, faith, love, hope,' of hellenistic origin, as *Reitzenstein* thinks is proved by Porphyrius, *ad Marcellum* 24, Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* iii, 69, 3; vii, 57, 4. Paul, he holds, adopted the formula, but, true to his conviction of the superiority of love over gnosis, omitted 'knowledge.'

*Harnack* protests vigorously against this view, and from numerous Pauline and other early Christian passages undertakes to prove the Christian origin of the triad. He believes that it grew naturally out of current formulas, each having two members, 'faith and love,' 'faith and hope.'

*Corssen* also doubts *Reitzenstein's* construction. He thinks that the four ideas were so deeply rooted in the philosophy of Porphyrius, that the supposition of his dependence for them on religious literature (so *Reitzenstein*) or, as *Harnack* suggests, on Paul himself, is superfluous. The Clement passages are to be explained from 1 Cor. 13, 13 and from Clement's own system. The whole sentence in 1 Cor. 13, 13 is sufficiently accounted for by the preceding context.

In his 'Nachwort,' 1917,<sup>1</sup> *Reitzenstein* assembles fresh proofs, drawn especially from the *Oracula Chaldaica*. It must be admitted that a hellenistic triad or tetrad analogous to the Christian triad may have been in existence, and there is no reason why it may not have been known in Corinth. In that case the language of 1 Cor. 13 would be more intelligible, but the theory would not solve all the problems. See R. Schütz, *ThLZ*, 1917, No. 26; Dibelius, *WklPh*, 1916, 1041; Wohlenberg, *ThLBl*, 1916, No. 17; C. Clemen, *ZKG*, N. F. 1, 178 f.

*Reitzenstein* (*Historia monachorum*, pp. 242 ff.) thinks he can explain from Porphyrius, *ad Marcellum* 13, another Pauline passage, 2 Cor. 3, 18. *Corssen* (ZNW) traverses both the interpretation of the passage of Porphyrius and the inferences for 2 Cor. 3, 18. He urges that the word ἐνοπτρίζεσθαι is used by Porphyrius (who twice employs it) to mean either (middle voice) 'be reflected' or (active) 'reflect.' Accordingly the sense 'looking into the mirror of the δόξα,' which *Reitzenstein* gives to the Pauline phrase, is not attested by Porphyrius. Just as Porphyrius means that God is reflected in the human spirit, so Paul (in *Corssen*'s view) says that the glory of the Lord is reflected on our face. *Corssen* includes an analysis of the whole chapter.

*Lütgert* has now extended to the Epistle to the Galatians his theory that a gnostic movement existed in the apostolic age and was of equal importance with Judaism. He supposes the polemic of the epistle to be pointed in two directions, — now both at once, now one at a time, — namely, against the Judaizers and against the self-styled 'spiritual' antinomians who blame Paul for inconsistency, reproach him with his submission to the Law, declare that he preaches circumcision (Gal. 5, 11; cf. 2, 18), and owes his gospel not to revelation but to an (unnamed) apostle, and who besides have introduced into Christianity the elements of the worship of Cybele. On this last account Paul affirms that these opponents had actually reverted to heathenism, since in 4, 8 ff. he means 'revert to the rudiments of instruction,' that is, to the Law, to which the heathen also are subject.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also *Reitzenstein's Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 2 ed. pp. 235 ff.

Lütgert's detailed exegesis is often highly artificial. And it is to be observed that in Galatians Paul nowhere indicates that he is arguing against two extreme parties of opposite tendencies. A heathenish libertinism he would have brought to check in a very different way. See Deissner, *ThGg* 14, 1920, 205-211.

*W. W. Jäger* has proposed a new interpretation of the difficult christological passage Phil. 2, 6. He takes the phrase *οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο* to be a commonly used idiom which regularly had the positive meaning, 'regard as a privilege,' 'enjoy,' 'turn to advantage.' This is chiefly on the ground of Heliodorus, *Aethiopica*, iv, 6; vii, 20; Plutarch, *de fortuna Alex.*, p. 418, 22 (Bernard.). The literal translation (*ἀρπαγμὸν* meaning 'usurpation') and all references to the myth of Satan or of Adam he vigorously opposes.

*Jülicher*, with a retort to Jäger's rather arrogant attitude, reviews the patristic exegesis of the passage, and himself favors the meaning, 'hold as too precious' or 'as indispensable,' 'refuse to yield what has been acquired with trouble and pains.'

*Schmiedel* will not admit 'enjoy,' but takes the phrase of the ambitious insistence on heavenly prerogatives. All the interpreters (including Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1915, No. 25-26) treat the reference of *ἀρπαγμὸν* to *res rapienda* (in contrast to *rapta*) as definitely excluded; Dibelius thinks that the notion must also be abandoned that Paul has in view any antithesis to the events in the spirit-world.<sup>1</sup>

*G. Kittel* (1) thinks that Mishna Aboth iii, 11 ("who defiles the sanctuaries," etc.) was aimed at Paul. Interesting as the passage is, this seems to me not proved. The saying is later than Paul's time, and can equally well have been directed against gentile Christians in general or against gnostic Minim, whom Philo likewise attacks. (2) Kittel's hypothesis to explain the word *ἐξουσία* in 1 Cor. 11, 10 fails to convince. He assumes beside שָׁלַט 'rule' another שָׁלַט from a different root meaning 'wrap,' and that thus *ἐξουσία* came to mean 'veil' in Jewish Greek. By the 'angels' he understands not lascivious demons but guardians of chastity. (3) In a treatment of 'Round Numbers' Kittel argues (against Gunkel and others)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also K. F. Proost, 'Adam-Christus-Satan' (*ThT*, 1916, 375-386).



that 'three and a half' has nothing to do with mythology or eschatological mysteries, but is merely a round number like 'five.' Even if that be granted, 'three and a half' may yet have become a definite term of an apocalyptic tradition. See *Musëum (Leiden)* 29, No. 5.

#### VI. CATHOLIC EPISTLES; HEBREWS; APOSTOLIC FATHERS

*Bornemann, W.*, Der erste Petrusbrief — eine Taufrede des Silvanus? (ZNW 19, 143–164). — *Haering, Th.*, Gedankengang und Grundgedanken des Hebräerbriefs (ZNW 18, 145–164). — *Lodder, W.*, De godsdienstige en zedelijke denkbeelden van 1 Clemens (Groningen dissertation). 244 pp. Leiden, van Nifterik, 1915.

The most important contribution to the study of the Catholic Epistles is the volume of *Meyer's Kommentar* on James by *M. Dibelius*, published in 1921 and already mentioned (p. 125).

*Bornemann* takes 1 Peter as originally a baptismal sermon (1, 3–5, 11) preached by Silvanus about the year 90 in some city of Asia Minor, and having for text Psalm 34, of which *Bornemann* finds traces all through the sermon. The dedication (1, 1–2) was added because guests from other churches asked for a copy. The name of Peter was added still later as a conjecture. A relation to baptism is evident in 1 Peter (see *Windisch, Taufe und Sünde*, pp. 227 ff.; *Perdelwitz, Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1. Petrusbriefs*, 1911), but to suppose that the whole epistle is a baptismal address is questionable, to say the least.

*Th. Haering* lays stress on the alternation of doctrinal statement and exhortation in Hebrews. With that characteristic in mind it becomes inappropriate (cf. among others my commentary on Hebrews in *Lietzmann's Handbuch*) to use the terms 'digression' and 'interruption'; and also in the parts other than hortatory a progress of thought can be perceived. *Haering* divides the epistle as follows: 1, 1–4, 16, introduction, which prepares for and leads up to the actual theme (4, 14–16); 5, 1–6, 20, preliminary discussion of the theme; 7, 1–10, 18, elaborated proof of the theme as the testimony of faith to the incomparable high-priesthood of the Son; 10, 19–13, 21, consequent exhortation to hold fast the confession. The analysis is made with great acuteness.

The commentaries on the Apostolic Fathers (Hermas by M. Dibelius has not yet appeared) in the supplementary volume to Lietzmann's *Handbuch* have already been mentioned. *Lodder* in his valuable book, although he forces the ideas of 1 Clement into the traditional frame of Christian dogmatics, yet gives a just account of the theology of the epistle, and does not fail to take account of its unsystematic character. He connects the ideas with their environment, and properly points out the contacts of 1 Clement with philosophy (cosmological conception of God as father, anthropology, eschatology), but neglects the preparation in Judaism for this hellenization of the religion of the Bible. He rightly admits an influence on the doctrine of 1 Clement from Pauline theology, or at least from Pauline formulas, side by side with a pervading moralistic piety, the source of which he finds obscure. Clement was a gentile and belonged to them "that are of Caesar's household" (Phil. 4, 22).

Reference should be made to the following contributions to the volume, *Harnack-Ehrung* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1921): E. Förster, 'Kirchenrecht vor dem 1. Clemensbrief'; M. Dibelius, 'Der Offenbarungsträger im "Hirten" des Hermas'; H. Windisch, 'Das Christentum des zweiten Clemensbriefes.' Finally see also G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, 'De jongste verdediging van de echtheid der Ignatiana' (NThT, 1915, 253-269).

## VII. HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

### A

*Weiss, J.*, Das Urchristentum. Herausgegeben und ergänzt von *R. Knopf*. xii, 687 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1917. — *Bernouilli, C. A.*, Johannes der Täufer und die Urgemeinde (Die Kultur des Evangeliums I). 504 pp. Leipzig, Der neue Geist Verlag, 1918. — *De Zwaan, J.*, Imperialisme van den oudchristelijken geest. 390 pp. Haarlem, F. Bohn, 1919.

### B

*Kiefl, F. X.*, Die Theorien des modernen Sozialismus über den Ursprung des Christentums. xxxii, 222 pp. München, Kösel, 1915. — *Eger, O.*, Rechtsgeschichtliches zum Neuen Testament (program). 46 pp. Basel, Reinhardt, 1919. — *Eger, O.*, Rechtswörter und Rechtsbilder in den paulinischen Briefen (ZNW 18, 84-108). — *Boenders, F. C. M.*, Keltische invloeden op het Nieuwe Testament (ThT, 1919, 137-144). — *Windisch, H.*, Der Untergang Jerusalems (Anno 70) im Urteil der Christen und Juden (ThT, 1914, 519-550).

## A

No hand was more competent to write a history of early Christianity than that of *Johannes Weiss*. Widely read in hellenistic literature, he was equipped to portray the environment of early Christianity as well as the new religion which arose therefrom; in many respects he departed from the views of the leaders of the '*religionsgeschichtliche Schule*.' But he was permitted to finish only his account of the work of Paul and of the further development of Christianity in Palestine and Syria. The first part of his book was published before the war; the remainder (pages 417-681), issued in 1917, consists partly of matter left ready for the press at the author's death in 1914, partly (from page 601 on) of supplementary chapters by *Rudolf Knopf*, who has himself since died.

Weiss was able to complete his account of Paul as Christian and as theologian; the section on 'hope' is succeeded by those on Pauline ethics, on Paul's conception of the world, and on the church. Of special note is the discussion of the Lord's Supper, in which he makes some corrections of the exegesis given in his commentary on 1 Corinthians. These chapters are followed by a survey of the post-pauline period in missionary work and the founding of churches, and by sketches of the history of Palestinian and Syrian Christianity. The Epistle of James is used as a document of the development of the Syrian church. Knopf has drawn in broad outline, and in the spirit of his *Geschichte des nachapostolischen Zeitalters*, the history of Asia Minor, of Macedonia and Achaia, and of Rome, so that the result is at least a self-contained history of the apostolic and post-apostolic age. See M. Dibelius, *ChrW*, 1916, No. 37; 1918, No. 29/30; G. A. v. d. Bergh v. Eysinga, *NThT*, 1918, pp. 170 ff.; K. Lake, *HThR*, 1922, pp. 97 ff.

In the first volume of his *Kultur des Evangeliums C. A. Bernouilli* the pupil, friend, and intellectual successor of Franz Overbeck, has written a most suggestive work on the rise of Christianity, and has presented the subject in a new light. He is close to the psycho-analytic school, and writes with a diffuse rhetoric which is often infelicitous, and the obscurity of which

is hardly dispelled by a second reading. The book, though it is almost devoid of any method in its argumentation, has the stimulating quality of great originality. The chief idea of the first volume is that John the Baptist gave the real start to Christianity. His eschatological baptism was not practised by Jesus, but was revived by Paul in pentecostal baptism, which took on a more cheerful tone from the spirit of Jesus, while among the disciples of the Baptist there was a recrudescence of religious fear. John taught repentance and self-purification; the new element in Christianity was the Spirit, who brings sanctification, and the enthusiasm which proceeds from the risen Christ. The chapter on the resurrection-faith, in which the author shows his training in psycho-analysis, calls for mention. Following Schweitzer, from whom he has learned much, the author emphasizes the purely Jewish origin of Christianity, and denies all derivation from syncretistic religion. See Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1920, No. 21-22.

Under his curious title *de Zwaan* gives a thoughtful account, intended for the general reader, of the development of early Christianity down to the secure establishment of the Catholic Church. In his introduction on Faith and History, he discusses the radical contention that the whole gospel is a poetic rhapsody, and also the views of scholars like Troeltsch, Harnack, Bousset, and Kirn, and urges that faith rests not on, but in, history. The resurrection of Jesus is a fact the possibility of which historical investigation leaves open, and which faith requires in order to assert itself. Among other successive topics de Zwaan treats of certain of the ideas of Jesus from a point of view influenced by Tyrrell, and indicates two roots of Christian 'imperialism,' namely, the reaction against the juristic spirit of the Pharisees and that against wrong and injustice in the world. In describing the formation of an eschatology no longer revolutionary but purely spiritual, he remarks on the prevalent failure in current discussions to give due weight to non-christian, cosmic eschatology. Toward the close is a masterly sketch of Tertullian in a few strokes; the book ends with Athanasius.



## B

Next to mythology, socialism is the leading factor in the modern radical criticism of the N. T. tradition. The Catholic theologian *F. X. Kiefl*, who exposed the philosophical foundations of the mythological theory in his book, *Der geschichtliche Christus und die moderne Philosophie* (1911), has now undertaken to show the historical derivation of the theories of modern socialism on the origin of Christianity, and to refute them. He finds that these views, too, have their roots in the Hegelian philosophy, which necessarily led to the socialistic theory of history; and he gives a survey of the history of the social conception of Christianity in protestant theology and in socialism — the real antichrist, as he terms it. His refutation rests on an historical and exegetical investigation of 1 Cor. 7, 21, of which he gives a conservative interpretation in accord with the church fathers. He explains that the emancipation of the slaves was not a part of the program of the church, and was prepared for by the church only in the religious and ethical emancipation effected by the gospel. In depicting the lot of the slaves in antiquity we must, he says, guard against exaggeration; only so is the attitude of Paul and the church justified. The oldest Christianity was not a proletarian, but a religious, movement. The early Christian idea of the state was conservative, as is shown by the attitude toward slavery. Kiefl gives a long series of illustrations and citations (not always exact) from the church fathers. The argument is sometimes superficial, but there is much information in the book.

*Eger* in his program elucidates from the papyri the trials at law described in the N. T., especially those of Paul, and shows that narrative and terminology fully correspond to the hellenistic legal documents. In connection with the trial of Paul he adduces an edict of Nero relating to the improvement of procedure in cases of *provocatio* to the emperor, and suggests that Paul was released because the Jewish complainants did not put in an appearance. He also takes up the legal words and legal figures in Paul (briefly in the program, more in detail and with learned material in ZNW). In Gal. 3, 17 ff.; 4, 1 f. he holds

that Paul had hellenistic (not Roman, nor Celtic) legal conditions in mind, and that he was alluding to the custom of attaching to a will a penal clause which protected the provisions of the document from the attack of a third party. In Gal. 4 Paul assumes the father to be dead, and to have appointed in his will guardians for a fixed term, as is often found in papyri. Eger rejects the idea of adoption by will, since that does not occur so late as the date of the hellenistic documents. After treating of the legal usage implied in 1 Cor. 3, 9 (the act of undertaking the charge of buildings), he closes with a discussion of the legal affairs implied in Philemon.

*Boenders* argues (against Eger) that the law implied in Gal. 4 is Celtic. Among the Celts it was customary for fathers in their own life-time (in Galatians it is not stated that the father is dead) to put their sons under tutors (in Gaul, Druids), by whom they were treated as slaves until on reaching their majority they returned as sons to their fathers' house.

In the case of so far-reaching an event in the earliest Christian period as the fall of Jerusalem, it is remarkable that no one has gathered and compared the various testimonies from Jewish and Christian literature as to its significance and cause. In my Leiden inaugural lecture (1914) I have made a beginning of this. The gospel passages comprise both genuine sayings and others that were produced by the church after the event; the central idea (as in later Christian feeling) was that it was a punishment for the crucifixion of Jesus. The Jews, too, saw in the catastrophe a punishment for national sin. Josephus has in mind chiefly the partisan strife of the rebellion and the profanation of the temple by the Jews themselves; the apocalyptic writers, although accounting for the event by the nation's sin, yet give comforting promises of a rebuilding; the rabbis find the guilt of the nation in inattention to rabbinical tradition and doctrine, but also lay weight on the retribution that has fallen on Titus and is destined to overwhelm the Roman empire. The pragmatic significance of the catastrophe for both religions is clearer from the Jewish than from the Christian testimonies. I have since collected more material and hope later to publish a monograph on the subject.

## VIII. THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

## A

*Daubanton, F. E.*, Geschiedenis der beoefening van de didaktiek des Nieuwen Verbonds. 278 pp. Utrecht, Keminck en Zoon, 1916. — *Feine, P.*, Theologie des Neuen Testaments. 3. Aufl. xv, 585 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1919. — *Weinel, H.*, Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Die Religion Jesu und des Urchristentums. 3. Aufl. xv, 675 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1921.

## B

*Bultmann, R.*, Die Bedeutung der Eschatologie für die Religion des Neuen Testaments (ZThK, 1917, 76–87). — *Pott, A.*, Das Hoffen im Neuen Testament in seiner Beziehung zum Glauben (Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 7). 204 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1915. — *Berkelbach van der Sprenkel, S. F. H. J.*, Vrees en Religie. Een psychologisch onderzoek toegepast op nieuw-testamentische gegevens (dissertation). 145 pp. Utrecht, 1920.

## C

*Wernle, P.*, Jesus und Paulus. Antithesen zu Bousset's Kyrios Christos (ZThK, 1915, No. 1–2); also, separately, 92 pp. Tübingen, Mohr. — *Bousset, W.*, Jesus der Herr. Nachträge und Auseinandersetzungen zu Kyrios Christos. 96 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1916. — *Heitmüller, W.*, Jesus und Paulus. Freundschaftliche kritische Bemerkungen zu P. Wernles Artikel "Jesus und Paulus" (ZThK, 1915, 156–179). — *Götz, K.*, Neue Forschungen zur Geschichte des Christusglaubens (KRef Schw 30, 1915, No. 29–33).

## D

*Haering, Th.*, Das Alte Testament im Neuen (ZNW, 1916, 213–227). — *Harnack, A. von*, Die Terminologie der Wiedergeburt und verwandter Erlebnisse in der ältesten Kirche (TU 42, 97–143). Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1918.

## A

The book of *F. E. Daubanton* († 1920, church professor at Utrecht) is a history of the study of the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, conceived in the traditional fashion. Its special value lies in the attention paid to Dutch, English, and American work, and in the accounts of the contents of the more important books, while the grouping and historical criticism are often defective, and unfortunately but little notice is taken of anything but substantial treatises. See Windisch, ThT 51, 1917, 233 ff.

Of German textbooks of New Testament Theology that of *P. Feine* is at present the most widely read. In the new edition

Feine holds more aloof than ever from the point of view of the history of religions, and insists on the freedom of Paul and John from the influences of later Judaism and Hellenism. "Today we have passed the crest of the wave of 'history of religions,'" is a sentence from his preface which constitutes a kind of program. His total aversion to the idea of foreign influences is connected with the establishment of the divine character of the person of Jesus. A sign of increased conservatism is his use in the present edition (unlike the earlier ones) of the Gospel of John as a source for the teaching of Jesus, — to confirm, explain, and complete the Synoptic tradition. With similar tendency, in the section on the teaching of Jesus, the chapter on Jesus' idea of his own mission now precedes those on the kingdom of God and the moral requirements, while a new chapter is added on Jesus' work in the power of the Spirit and on his promise of the Spirit. The new edition shows some other changes in arrangement, and many abbreviations and expansions, corresponding to the progress of recent investigations but all exhibiting the author's strong conservative bent.

The new edition of *Weinel's* admirable text-book has undergone important modifications of the text, but none in the point of view. It is a general presentation of early Christianity as conceived by students of the history of religions, although in the critical exposition he gives more prominence to religious values than is usual. In a new chapter on the influence of mystery-religion the thesis of Reitzenstein and Bousset is accepted, in opposition to Schweitzer.

## B

*Bultmann*, following out the ideas of J. Weiss and myself (ZwTh, 1912) has tried to define more exactly the significance of eschatology for New Testament religion by showing the part which faith in eschatology takes in the moral and religious utterances. The eschatological motive spurs to moral effort; in certain fields of ethics the term 'interim ethics' holds good; and eschatology furnishes a background for the idea of the transcendence of God and of his superiority to the world, and for the optimism of faith in God, as well as for the dualism of



the Christian view of things. It seems as if a more essential significance were here assigned to eschatology than Bultmann himself is disposed to acknowledge.

Schlatter's discussion of Faith in the N. T. and Lütgert's of Love are now followed by a treatment of Hope, by *A. Pott*, carried out, as is right, with special reference to the relation of hope to faith. Pott first considers hope in the later Jewish literature, including Philo but not the Talmud. In the apocalyptic writings hope is chiefly eschatological trust, while faith includes confession and obedience as essential elements, much as in the Psalms; Philo's idea of faith has gained more of religious depth. In the consciousness of Jesus an unexampled elevation and a new element are found, for in him faith is completely imbued with hope, he has God, and the future and present are intermingled. It is due to the Synoptic writers that faith and hope have again drawn apart, and that both have acquired an eschatological reference. Paul is acquainted with this eschatologically oriented hope, but in the mystical union with Christ, and by virtue of the Spirit of Christ, faith and hope become once more identified, although in the form of eschatological hope. In the epistles from the time of persecution eschatological hope becomes the central idea; in later writings that place is again taken by faith, but in the form of confession. This is the case in John, with whom, however, faith is a knowledge which unites mysticism and gnosis. It is doubtful if all this is so, but the investigation is not without value for the understanding of Christian piety. See the incisive criticism of Bultmann, *ThR*, 1916, 113 ff.

With a background of discussion of general psychology and the psychology of religion *Berkelbach van der Sprenkel* presents his discussion of Fear and Religion as a kind of illustration of his psychological analysis. Treating of fear as a religious phenomenon and a religious motive, the author deals chiefly with primitive peoples, but includes the piety of the Old Testament. In his suggestive but incomplete sketch (pp. 50-75) he points out that the higher the grade of the piety, — that is, the more intimate the communion, — the more is fear overcome by such feelings as trust and love. His thought

is often similar to the views (with which he was not acquainted) of R. Otto in his book, *Das Heilige*, although he does not emphasize the 'sense of being a creature' as strongly as Otto. The New Testament part (pp. 76-145) discusses anxious care (*Bezorgdheid*), fear of men, of death, of demons, fear in the presence of Jesus, the sinner's fear in the presence of God, and fear in the prospect of the Last Things, — various types of fear which are overcome through the revelation of God in Jesus. The work is uneven, but it is all instructive, and the book is one of the best monographs of recent years.

## C

In the inquiry into the origin of N. T. christology, Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* still holds the centre of the stage. Of the criticisms on it the most impassioned and detailed is that of Bousset's friend *P. Wernle*, who limits himself to the most important theme, namely, Jesus and Paul. He discusses Bousset's theses on the faith in Christ of the primitive church, on Jesus and the messianic hope, and on Paul's faith in the Lord (*Kyriosglaube*). His view is that before Paul the church invoked Jesus as Son of God and as *Kyrios* (Ps. 110; *marana tha*), and maintained vital communion with him as risen from the dead. He assembles the data which testify to a messianic consciousness on the part of Jesus (execution as king of the Jews, entry into Jerusalem, the request of the sons of Zebedee, idea of the kingdom of God as already present); and argues that the faith in the resurrection cannot be accounted for by myths. Paul's christology and doctrine of salvation Wernle would explain (in opposition to Bousset) by primitive Christian tradition, Paul's own experience, rabbinical interpretation of the O. T., and other rabbinical traditions, with no hellenistic influence. He denies that the primitive hellenistic church was an intermediate step between the original Apostles and Paul (Heitmüller), and rejects Bousset's thesis that the most important innovation in christology introduced by Paul had its starting-point in the cultus; personal mysticism is primary, cult-mysticism secondary. Paul's anthropology is due not to Philo and the Hermetic literature but to the Old Testament and the doctrine of the rabbis.

In his interesting rejoinder *Bousset* withdraws some untenable theses and furnishes a better argumentative foundation for his views than hitherto. While he makes some concessions with reference to the faith in Christ of the Palestinian church, he still insists that they did not use the title *Kyrios* or practise worship of the Lord. *Marana tha* he now explains as a Jewish formula used in oaths and affirmations. In spite of exorcism in the name of Jesus, and of the Lord's Supper, he holds it questionable whether the primitive church had any strong sense of the nearness of the Lord; and reaffirms his belief that the *Kyrios*-cult arose on Greek soil. Wernle, he declares, understands Pauline Christianity according to the scheme of the protestant reformers, an understanding inconsistent with the changed attitude of Paul to the sin of Christians. Bousset also adopts Heitmüller's thesis that Paul's conversion did not involve the collapse of nomistic moralism; justification and moral catastrophe were secondary to faith in Christ and the mystic union. Paul's dualism and pessimism can not be wholly explained as proceeding from rabbinical Jewish sources but were of hellenistic origin.

Before Bousset's rejoinder appeared, *Heitmüller*, falling under the same criticisms, issued his counterblast, virtually an explanation and justification of the views criticised by Wernle in ZNW, 1912, 320 ff., especially the thesis that the ideas of hellenistic Christians constituted the real basis for Paul's theological construction. He would not exclude the notion of original experience as controlling Paul, but urges that his forms of expression were drawn from the tradition and environment of the gentile Christians with whom he associated almost exclusively in the period from Damascus to Antioch. Like Bousset he denies the existence of the *Kyrios*-cult in Jerusalem; only in hellenism did the conditions precedent exist. Heitmüller shows great caution in his inquiries.

The *present reviewer*, in 'Christuskult und Paulinismus,' ThT, 1916, 216-225, is in large part, but not completely, in accord with Bousset. The worship of Jesus as the heavenly 'Lord' must be ascribed to the primitive church, although a 'Christ-cult' could only be elaborated on gentile Christian soil.

Bousset has overestimated the hellenistic factor in Pauline theology and underestimated the Jewish element. The connection between Jesus, the primitive church, and Paul is to be sought chiefly in their eschatology. Bousset's proposed distinction (see p. 203 above) between primary and secondary elements cannot be carried out, since the doctrine of justification, — that is, Paul's controversy with Judaism, — is not secondary. Jewish and hellenistic, Palestinian and hellenistic, are everywhere intermingled.

*K. Götz's* criticism of Bousset is similar to that of Wernle, insisting even more strongly on the Jewish element in Paul. The title of 'Lord' is inseparable, he holds, from the conception of (royal) messiah. The Greek preference for *Kyrios* is to be explained by the strangeness of the title 'Christ' and from the Christian hostility to oriental and hellenistic worship of rulers. Götz ascribes Paul's anthropological pessimism and his dualistic doctrine of salvation rather to hellenistic gnostic traditions; while the doctrine of vicarious suffering and the collective idea of the second Adam are Jewish, and a Jewish analogy to the worship of a divine mediator may be found in the legend of Moses, cf. *Ecclus.* 45, 2; *1 Cor.* 10, 1 ff.

See also P. Althaus, 'Unser Herr Jesus,' *NkZ*, 1915, 439-457, 513-545; and on the whole controversy E. Vischer, *ThR*, 1916, 294-318. Bousset left a revision of his *Kyrios Christos*, embodying the results of the whole discussion, which was edited by G. Krüger, 1921 (394 pp.)<sup>1</sup>

## D

The chief objection to be taken to the inquiries of Bousset, Reitzenstein, and the other students of the history of religions, is that they have neglected the antecedents of the New Testament in the Old Testament and Judaism. In a discussion of principles and method, with some illustrations, *Th. Haering* points out the importance of recognizing that the New Testament is conditioned by the Old. We need to ask what Old Testament ideas and materials, what books and persons, have

<sup>1</sup> The book 'Jesus der Herr' is still useful even after the appearance of the second edition of 'Kyrios Christos.'



influenced the New Testament, and how any Old Testament word is understood in the New. The study of the New Testament must not neglect the Old Testament passages which underlie the New Testament passage under discussion; for instance, for the Lord's Prayer 1 Chron. 29, 10 ff. must be ad-duced; for Matt. 28, 18, Dan. 7, 14; for Rom. 12, 9, Ps. 97, 10; for 1 Cor. 10, 21, Mal. 1, 7, 12. Similarly with the chief New Testament terms and Old Testament usage. Haering's warning, in itself not unneeded, overlooks the fact that the New Testament interpretation of an Old Testament passage often depends on ideas which lie far from the Old Testament, and that ideas found in the Old Testament have commonly suffered a change of meaning when used in the New. Christianity presents a new product, and later Judaism and Hellenism both have their share in it.

*Harnack's* lexicographical study on the terminology of regeneration and kindred experiences in the early church follows a similar tendency. From the use in the Apostolic Fathers, and other early literature, of New Testament expressions, such as *παιδιά, νήπιοι, ἀνακαινίζεσθαι* and its synonyms, *ἐκλογή, υἱοθεσία, ἐλευθερία, φίλοι* and *ἀδελφοί, καινή κτίσις* and its synonyms, *καινὸς ἄνθρωπος* and its synonyms, he concludes that these are almost completely explained from the Christian religion and the hellenistic Jewish use of language. Down to the end of the second century the religion of the church was no 'mystery,' but a religion of the spirit, with ideas and images, to be sure, which were also customary in mystery-religions, and the use of which led to the later transformation of the Christian church into a mystery-fellowship. Harnack urges caution on the students of the environment of early Christianity, but does not offer a refutation of their results; his discussion of regeneration is unsatisfactory, for on that point a combination of the LXX and Christian experience is not an adequate explanation. See Deissner, *ThGg*, 1919, 175 ff.

# IX. ELUCIDATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FROM THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

## A

*Van den Bergh van Eysinga, G. A.*, Voorchristelijk Christendom. De voorbereiding van het Evangelie in de Hellenistische wereld. 188 pp. Zeist, Ploegsma, 1918. — *De Zwaan, J.*, Antieke Cultuur om en achter het Nieuwe Testament. 1. ed. 141 pp.; 2. ed. 149 pp. Haarlem, F. Bohn, 1916, 1918. — *Lohmeyer, E.*, Christuskult und Kaiserkult. 58 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1919. — *Plooij, D.*, Kynisme en Christendom (ThSt, 1915, 1-32). — *Bugge, Chr. A.*, Das Christumysterium. Studien zur Revision der Geschichte des Urchristentums. 127 pp. Christiania, Dybwad, 1915.

## B

*Reitzenstein, R.*, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen. 2. Aufl. viii, 268 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1920. — *Reitzenstein, R.*, Das mandaeische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung (SAH, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1919). 98 pp. — *Wetter, G. P.*, Phös. 189 pp. Upsala, Akademiska bokhandeln; Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1915. — *Lohmeyer, E.*, Vom göttlichen Wolgeruch (SAH, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1919). 52 pp.

## C

*Heinrici, G.*, Die Hermesmystik und das Neue Testament (Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentums 1). xx, 242 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1918. — *Windisch, H.*, Urchristentum und Hermesmystik (ThT, 1918, 186-240). — *Dibelius, M.*, Die Isisweihe bei Apuleius und verwandte Initiations-Riten (SAH, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1917). 54 pp. — *Dibelius, M.*, Die Christianisierung einer hellenistischen Formel (NJkA 35, 1915, 224-236). — *Leisegang, H.*, Der heilige Geist. Das Wesen und Werden der mystisch-intuitiven Erkenntnis in der Philosophie und Religion der Griechen. I. Band, 1. Teil: Die vorchristlichen Anschauungen und Lehren vom Pneuma und der mystisch-intuitiven Erkenntnis. 267 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1919.

## D

*Clemen, C.*, Die Reste der primitiven Religion im ältesten Christentum. 172 pp. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1916.

## A

The book of *van den Bergh van Eysinga* gives a comprehensive account of the philosophical and religious tendencies in the hellenistic environment of Christianity, together with an attempt to show the essential derivation of Christianity from this environment. The title, 'Prechristian Christianity,' has thus the force of a program, much as in the case of W. B. Smith's

*Der vorchristliche Jesus.* Nevertheless the book has value apart from its questionable conclusions. The significance of the Cynics and the Stoa, together with the Stoic popular philosophy and the other doctrines prevalent in the earlier imperial period, the coming of astrology from the East and its great influence, the mystery-religions and hellenistic mysticism, and the Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, are described, and the book closes with an 'Appplication,' in which the author seeks to establish the thesis that the gospel is a metaphysical poem, the fruit of a combination of oriental and western thought. What is depicted in the gospels is not a noble teacher but a metaphysical being, in the elaboration of which Orient and Hellenism wrought in common. Of some interest is the reference to Seneca's tragedy, *Hercules Oetaeus*, as a counterpart to the gospel of the suffering and glorified Son of God (see also *Tijdschrift v. Wijsbegeerte*, 1921, 161-178). The author's defect is that he has overlooked the profound differences between Christianity and Hellenism and the complete contrast in their general character. He does not do justice to the eschatological, messianic character of the gospels, while the hellenistic analogies which he adduces are trivial and beside the mark. The historical figure of the human Jesus of Nazareth, imbued with the piety of the Old Testament and animated by prophetic and messianic spirit, gave the indispensable first impulse which led to the creation of a Christian church.

A gospel propagated by purely literary means, itself a fictitious invention, could never have gained credence in Palestine. This observation of mine (*ThT*, 1918, 318) *van den Bergh van Eysinga* tries to repel (*NThT*, 1919, 274 ff.) from Enoch 71, where Enoch, a mythical person, is exalted to be Son of Man, that is, messiah. But he fails to notice (1) that the author of the Book of Enoch certainly looked on Enoch as a real person, unlike the creators of the Christ-myth; (2) that Enoch 71 makes the impression of a hasty combination, not elaborated, and devoid of effect; (3) that while it is true that Enoch is subsequently exalted to be Son of Man, there is no idea whatever of his having appeared on earth as Son of Man nor any expectation of his return as Son of Man. The parallel, important in

itself, must be regarded as wholly without value for the problem of the historicity of Jesus.

For other discussions of the controversy over the Christ-myth see ThR, 1916, 353 ff.; 1917, 315 ff. The most recent work of the radical school is A. Drews, *Das Markusevangelium als Zeugnis der Geschichte Jesu*, with twelve astronomical charts (326 pp., Jena, Diederichs, 1921), in which it is attempted to derive the whole of Mark either from O. T. types and prophecies or from the changing positions of the constellations. K. F. Proost, *De beteekenis van Jesus Christus voor ons geloofsleven* (67 pp., Zeist, Ploegsma, 1919), relegates the historical human figure of Jesus wholly to the background, and in its place seeks to develop the figure of 'Christ' as symbol of our piety. For refutation of the Christ-myth see J. Leipoldt, *Hat Jesus gelebt?* (47 pp., Leipzig, Dörffling und Franke, 1920). A popular summary of the specifically Dutch radical views is to be found in the late H. W. Ph. E. van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Het Christusmysterie* (247 pp., Zeist, Ploegsma, 1917); see ThR, 1917, 315 ff. Of lasting value is P. Zondervan, *Radicale Christusbeschouwingen* (245 pp., Leeuwarden, Meyer en Schaafsma, 1915), a critical account of the views of Strauss, B. Bauer, Loman, Kalthoff, J. M. Robertson, Jensen, W. B. Smith, Bolland (†1922), A. Drews, and A. Niemojewski.

After a different fashion *J. de Zwaan*, the complete opposite of van den Bergh van Eysinga, portrays the environment of the New Testament. He paints a vivid and well proportioned picture, but fails a little to see that early Christianity tended to look only on the dark sides of the heathen state. He compares with Christianity the rational religion which (in spite of the intrusion of astrology and demonology) prevailed in Hellenism of the Roman period, and describes Ptolemy and Bardesanes as men who exhibit strongly the impress of ancient Gnosis, together with Ignatius as an opponent of Gnosis. Although he unduly disparages the relative value of these 'preparatory' men and forces, and exaggerates their difference from Christianity, these popular lectures deserve attention. See ThT, 1917, 240 ff.; van den Bergh van Eysinga, NThT, 1917, 388 ff.



Building chiefly on Reitzenstein's work, *Bugge* conceives early Christianity as a mystery-religion and the church as a company of mystery-devotees. The most debatable aspect of his view is his contention that the roots of all this were planted in older Jewish mystery-circles (Essenes, Therapeutae). He identifies mystery-circles and prophetic circles, and so comes to attribute the character of mysteries to the Israelitish prophetic religion. From the epistles and gospels he collects the most important 'mystery-testimonies.' The dependence on Judaism is seen in Paul's putting Christ into the place of the torah, and transferring to him its attributes (rule, pre-existence, sonship to God); Jesus himself had given the impulse to this in the words (Matt. 11) in which he designates himself the son of God, as the realization (*Verwirklichung*) of the torah. In Matt. 11 the mystery-preaching of Jesus begins; with the aid of Matthew, *Bugge* traces its development, and goes on to assemble and annotate the most important mystical passages of Paul and John. The collections are not worthless, but the book utterly lacks critical method. With no understanding of the problems, Jesus, Paul, and John are presented without any idea of the differences between them or of the nature of the evolutionary process at work.

*E. Lohmeyer* has given a popular account, with full and learned notes, of the history of the worship of the emperors and of the resistance of the Christians, with a discussion of the possible influence of the struggle on the worship of Christ. The latter is parallel to, not derived from, the worship of the emperors; the influence and the resistance grew slowly, cf. Phil. 3, 20 and the greater effect perceptible in the Pastorals, the writings of Luke, and the Apocalypse. See Windisch, *ThLZ*, 1920, No. 3-4.

*Plooi* draws an interesting comparison between Christianity and the doctrine of the Cynics, not so much in order to prove Cynic influence on Christianity as to show that Cynic doctrine with its ascetic and atheistic tendency had prepared the ground for Christianity. He brings into relief the contrasts, especially the conscious attitude of the Cynics toward the gods. See also A. Sizoo, *De beteekenis der Cynisch-Stoische propaganda voor de verbreiding van het evangelie*, Amsterdam, Kirchner, 1921.

## B

The most important monograph on the hellenistic mysteries and their influence on Christianity still remains *Reitzenstein's* book. In the new edition the author has introduced the new knowledge gained by his studies of Manichæan, Mandaean, and Iranian texts. He now holds that the fundamental conceptions of hellenistic Gnosis come from the Mazdaean religion. He has had access not only to the religious writings hitherto known but also to the texts discovered at Turfan, including a hymn of Zarathustra. The chief point is the myth of the god 'Man' (*Mensch*), who descended into matter and having been raised again returned to his home; what befalls the god, who is at the same time the world-soul, is also the lot of the 'believer.' From the Iranian (instead of the Egyptian) Reitzenstein now derives the New Testament  $\delta\delta\xi\alpha$  (pp. 211 f.). He also (pp. 237 ff.) discusses the problem of 1 Cor. 13, 13 (see above, pp. 190 f.) and now derives the formula of Porphyrius from the Iranian. See Harnack, *ThLZ*, 1921, No. 3-4; O. Gruppe, *BphW*, 1921, 362-369.

The text of the Mandaean book 'The Lord of Greatness,' on which *Reitzenstein* has written an essay, is to be found (in two forms) translated in Brandt's *Mandäische Schriften*, pp. 3 ff. Reitzenstein analyzes the third and fourth parts of this book, containing the instruction of Adam and Eve and an apocalypse which must have been composed soon after the year 70. This apocalypse is directed against the Jews, and tells how the Jews build Jerusalem, and how Enoch appears in human form in Palestine and baptizes, but presently, in revenge for the slaying of his disciples, obtains from God permission for the destruction of Jerusalem. Jesus is here attacked as a Jewish false prophet. Reitzenstein draws attention to the parallel between this text and Matt. 23, 11, Mk. 13 and parallels. As Wisdom speaks in Matt. 23, so does Enoch in the Mandaean apocalypse. The connection of the New Testament tradition with the anthropos-myth thus receives fresh confirmation; the Mandaean community shows itself as akin to, and a rival of, Judaism. The gospel texts are referred to

Mandaean origin, — a conclusion which is not altogether convincing; Acts. 6, 13 is also explained as going back to Mandaean tradition, as well as the similar saying about the temple, Mk. 14, 58.

In particular Reitzenstein now attributes the tradition of the Son of Man to Iranian sources, with the surprising result that Jesus himself had the consciousness that he was Enoch. In this he is in opposition to Bousset, who ascribed the origin of all the Son of Man passages to the church. In opposition to Brandt, Reitzenstein holds that the introduction of John the Baptist into the Mandaean doctrine took place much earlier; Johannine disciples who were unwilling to pass over into the Christian church joined the Mandaean Enoch-worshippers, affirming that John was the true foreteller of Enoch. A brief survey of these and similar far-reaching hypotheses is given by Reitzenstein in his article, 'Iranischer Erlösungsglaube' (ZNW, 1921, .1-23), and further discussion in his latest book, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (272 pp., Bonn, Marcus und Weber, 1921).

In the attempt to refer hellenistic ideas to a Persian origin Reitzenstein had a predecessor in *G. P. Wetter*, whose book entitled 'Phōs' is at once an inquiry into hellenistic piety, and a contribution to the understanding of Manichaeism. Here, too, the wide use of a common symbol is illustrated from the whole of oriental hellenistic literature, so that New Testament and early Christian formulas and usages find in it their explanation. Wetter pays attention both to the actual use of light in magic and ritual worship and to the symbolical and spiritual use of the word 'light' derived therefrom. Thus 'illumination,' 'light,' is equivalent to 'gnosis,' 'salvation'; to 'become light' is to 'become God,' etc. Wetter seeks the ultimate origin of the religious symbolism of light in Old Babylonian astrology; Mazdaism, Mandaeism, Manichaeism are various religious movements in which the idea of light was propagated. In the period of syncretism and astrology it made its way into Hellenism, to which the idea was congenial that the redemption and knowledge conferred through the mysteries are to be understood as illumination and as impregnation with

light-substance. Harnack, *ThLZ*, 1915, 523 f., justly complains that the Old Testament light-motives have been overlooked by Wetter; of more value are the reviews by M. Dibelius, *DLZ*, 1915, 1469-1483, and Nilsson, *GGA*, 1916.

Like the divine light, the divine fragrance is a perception by the senses which betrays the nearness of the deity and symbolizes the communication of divine power. *E. Lohmeyer* has made a very extended collection of testimonies on this subject from classical mythology, the Egyptian and Persian religions, and the Israelitish and Jewish literature, with evidence of the effect of those ideas on the oldest Christian literature. The whole study might be called a gigantic note to 2 Cor. 2, 14 f. Fragrance is the sign of the gods, and likewise distinguishes the pious in paradise; it played a part in worship, especially in Egypt; and it has soteriological significance, the aspect which is most prominent in the Christian use of the idea. See Gressmann, *ThLZ*, 1921, No. 19-20; Gruppe, *DLZ*, 1921, 42.

On hellenistic religion see also *Weinreich, O.*, *Neue Urkunden zur Sarapis-Religion*. 39 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1919. — *Smits, J. C. P.*, *De Keizerrogi*. 38 pp. Leiden, Brill, 1915. — *De Jong, K. H. E.*, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in religionsgeschichtlicher, ethnologischer, und psychologischer Beleuchtung*. 2. Aufl. 448 pp. Leiden, Brill, 1919; sharply criticised by *Reitzenstein*, *BphW*, 1919, No. 40.

## C

The Hermetic writings still present unsolved problems, but the posthumous book of *G. Heinrici* († 1915) does not contribute to their solution. His purpose, indeed, was not to throw new light on the origin of the Hermetic literature, but to determine their relation to the New Testament by analyzing the contents of the individual documents and working out the variety and the contrasts of their fundamental ideas. The tables of contents which Heinrici gives are very useful, although, as Reitzenstein has shown, not a few misunderstandings and mistakes have crept in. The second part of the study, on 'Hermes-mysticism and Early Christianity,' was unfortunately left a torso. Heinrici had a fine sense for the differences between hellenistic mysticism and New Testament religion. He admits contact of the New Testament books (Paul,



Hebrews, John, etc.) with the Hermetic writings, but insists everywhere on the 'peculiarity' (*Eigenart*) and originality of Christianity. In the case of specially striking resemblances he often assumes influence from the Christian side on the Hermetic writings (especially in Tracts I and XIII). Heinrici's polemic, not always to the point, is chiefly aimed at Reitzenstein and Bousset.

The slashing criticism by *Reitzenstein* (GGA, 1918, 241-274) has the value of an independent treatment of the subject. He points out that the Egyptian origin of the Hermetic writings is now proved by Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1381. He clears up various misunderstandings and errors of translation. In opposition to Heinrici, who supposes a relatively late origin of the Corpus, he brings fresh arguments to show that the literature must have been in existence in the first century after Christ. The idea of Christian influence he decidedly rejects; and to prove influence on early Christianity from Hermetic mysticism he argues that differences in mode of apprehension and nuance prove nothing, and further that the borrowing of figurative ideas or technical words is perfectly consistent with a sense of religious originality on the part of Christians. See also M. Dibelius, DLZ, 1919, Nos. 11-12, 13-14, with many noteworthy observations; Deissner, ThGg, 1918; v. d. Bergh v. Eysinga, NThT, 1919, 389 ff.; G. Hönnicke, LZBl, 1920, No. 6; Posselt, BphW, 1919, No. 49.

The *present reviewer's* article is an inquiry into the possibility of Christian influence on the Hermetic writings. (J. M. Creed, 'The Hermetic Writings,' JThSt, 1914, 513-538, became known to me only later.) After showing that the Hermetica certainly show contact with the Old Testament (Genesis, Psalms, wisdom-literature), I have urged that, while Heinrici's proofs are not strong, there are single expressions connected with conversion and regeneration in which Christian terminology might have played a part, especially in Tract IV. In any case these parallels call for further research. On the other hand the number of New Testament ideas which betray hellenistic influence can be increased. I have noted parallels to Mk. 9, 19 (and parallels), 1 Peter 2, 25, Jas. 3, 5, Mk. 10, 18,

Matt. 13, 1 ff., 24 ff., Mk. 1, 32, further to Hermas and Barnabas (see my commentary on Barnabas in Lietzmann's Handbuch). See also Deissner, ThGg, 1919, 179 ff.; C. Clemen, ZKG, N. F. 1, 173 f.

*M. Dibelius* has investigated the passage of Apuleius, *Metam.* xi, 23, which treats of initiation into the mysteries of Isis, and tries to prove that the well known sentence, *accessi confinium mortis*, etc. is a ritual formula; he makes it clear, in opposition to De Jong, that no occult practices or experience of visions lie behind it, but sacramental dramatic action. Accordingly he proposes a new explanation for the teaching opposed in Colossians and for Col. 2, 18. By ἐμβατεύειν in that passage he thinks is meant the entrance into the sanctuary, which the initiate has previously seen in his ecstasy; in any case we must admit that he has proved the word to be a technical expression of the mysteries. The teachers opposed in Colossians are, according to Dibelius, mystery-priests, who had been initiating Christians with the result that these Christians transformed their Christianity to correspond to the mysteries. See C. Clemen, ZKG, N. F. 1, 179 f.

The hellenistic formula which *Dibelius* in the second article proves to have passed into Christian use — a parallel to Reitzenstein's explanation of 1 Cor. 13, 13 — is the introductory phrase of Eph. 4, 5 f. From Marcus Aurelius vii, 9 he tries to show that the hellenistic tradition employed such introductory formulas; possibly Josephus, *c. Apion.* ii, 193, where the cosmic formula has already received an ecclesiastical significance, may represent a preliminary stage toward the passage in Ephesians.

The book of *H. Leisegang* promises to be a thorough and illuminating treatment of the rise of Hellenism as a mixture of Greek and Oriental civilization and thought, as well as a discussion of the meaning of this syncretistic product for germinant Christianity. The author takes the idea of the Holy Spirit in order to portray this process, and institutes two inquiries: first, Is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit of Greek or of oriental origin? and secondly, What has been the process of the interweaving of Greek philosophy and oriental mysticism, and what part has been played therein by the idea of a super-rational



divine Spirit, superior to the human spirit? Leisegang very felicitously takes as his point of departure Philo, who gives the clearest indication of the problem on both its sides; and the whole of the first volume is devoted to Philo's doctrine of the Spirit and the proof of its complete derivation from the ideas of Greek philosophy. He succeeds in disentangling the many contradictions in Philo's doctrine and in carrying back the various conceptions to their roots in Stoic materialism, Platonic dualism, and Greek popular religion. Judaism is wholly omitted, — a defect, in my opinion, and one associated with the author's complete omission of the Israelitish and Jewish doctrine from his account of the development of the idea of the Spirit (see P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes . . . im Alten Testament*, 1910). The distinction is important which he draws between the notion that the Spirit belongs to man by nature and the idea that it comes by a sudden super-mundane irruption of power. The discussion of the specifically Hellenic idea of prophetic inspiration is particularly good, although here, too, the Israelitish analogies are overlooked (see G. Hölscher, *Die Profeten*, Leipzig, 1913). In this connection he analyzes 'ecstasy' in Philo and in the religion and philosophy of the Greeks.

## D

C. Clemen's book leads us into quite different fields of religious phenomena. In it this well-read author has made an appropriate supplement to his book on the interpretation of the New Testament from the point of view of the history of religions. He is able to point out an amazing number of survivals in the New Testament of a primitive stage of religion. Fetish-worship, faith in elements, the worship of the heavens and the heavenly bodies, of animals, men, and spirits; further, religious relation to higher powers, the maintenance and conquest of these powers, influence exerted on them by magic, defence against them, etc.; — all these have left their traces in the New Testament. In his arrangement Clemen follows the systematization employed in the study of primitive religions. To complete the work a survey would be desirable of the various kinds of influence which these primitive ideas and usages have

exerted, for it makes a difference whether a primitive element has been preserved in more or less concrete form or only in a word whose original meaning had long been lost or transcended. Also Clemen does not distinguish between ideas which have been retained in the New Testament, either among the rank and file of believers or by the leaders themselves, and views which the New Testament combats; thus the opposition of Jesus to the rabbis may be regarded as a case of opposition to primitive usages surviving in Judaism. Another defect in an otherwise excellent book is the failure to take account of New Testament sacramentalism and the primitive notions that lurk there. An appendix treats of primitive myths and sagas in the New Testament. See ThT, 1917, 248 ff.; H. Haas, ZMR, 1916, 317 ff.; Beth, DLZ, 1919, No. 22-24; Deissner, ThGg, 1917, 224 ff.; van den Bergh van Eysinga, NThT, 1917, 323 ff.